

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

WINTHROP S. HUDSON, *Chairman*

MATTHEW SPINKA

RAY C. PETRY

JAMES HASTINGS NICHOLS

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS, *ex officio*

Vol. XIX

June, 1950

No. 2

Contents of previous issues of *CHURCH HISTORY* may be found by consulting the *International Index to Periodicals* in your library.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORIGEN, EUSEBIUS, AND THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY <i>George Florovsky</i>	77
GEORGE D. HERRON AND THE KINGDOM MOVEMENT <i>Robert T. Handy</i>	97
ZWINGLI STUDY SINCE 1918 <i>Bard Thompson</i>	116
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY, APRIL 21-22, 1950	129
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE SOCIETY, APRIL 21, 1950	131
BOOK REVIEWS:	133
JONES, A. H. M.: <i>Constantine and the Conversion of Europe</i>	Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.
SARTON, GEORGE: <i>Introduction to the History of Science</i>	Milton V. Anastos

CONTENTS

NELSON, BENJAMIN N.: <i>The Idea of Usury</i>	J. Allen Cabaniss
TRINTERUD, L. J.: <i>The Forming of an American Tradition</i>	Robert Hastings Nichols
MCGINN, D. J.: <i>The Admonition Controversy</i>	J. M. Batten
ROSS, ISABEL: <i>Margaret Fell, Mother of Quakerism</i>	James F. Maclear
WARD, MAISIE: <i>Young Mr. Newman</i>	Charles H. Lyttle
BORNKAMM, HEINRICH: <i>Grundriss zum Studium der Kirchengeschichte</i>	Roland H. Bainton
BUCHANAN, GEORGE: <i>The Powers of the Crown in Scotland</i>	John T. McNeill
DRURY, C. M.: <i>A Teepee in His Front Yard</i>	Robert D. Clark
BARCLAY, W. C.: <i>Early American Methodism</i>	Robert W. Goodloe
BOOK NOTICES	146
ANNOUNCEMENT	147

ORIGEN, EUSEBIUS, AND THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY

GEORGE FLOROVSKY

S. Vladimir's Seminary, New York

The Iconoclastic controversy was undoubtedly one of the major conflicts in the history of the Christian Church. It was not just a Byzantine conflict; the West was also involved in the dispute. It is true, however, that the West never followed the East in the theological argument, nor did it suffer all the implications and consequences of the Byzantine theology of the Icons. In the history of the Christian East it was, on the contrary, a turning point. All levels of life were affected by the conflict, all strata of society were involved in the struggle. The fight was violent, bitter, and desperate. The cost of victory was enormous, and tensions in the Church were not solved by it. The Church in Byzantium has never recovered again her inner unity, which had been distorted or lost in the Iconoclastic strife.

Strangely enough, we seem to have lost the key to this momentous crisis of history. The origin, the meaning, and the nature of the Iconoclastic conflict are rather uncertain and obscure. Modern historians do not agree on the main points of the interpretation. It has been fashionable for several decades, since Paparrigopoulo and Vasiljevsky, to interpret the Iconoclastic crisis primarily in political and social categories and to regard its religious aspect as a side issue. It has been variously suggested that originally the conflict had nothing to do with doctrine, and theological arguments or charges were invented, as it were, *post factum*, as efficient weapons in the struggle. Some historians went so far as to suggest that the religious problem was simply a kind of a "smoke screen," manufactured and employed by the rival parties as a disguise to conceal the true issue, which was economic.¹ Even quite recently, a prominent Byzantine scholar contended that theology "counted for noth-

¹ K. N. Ouspensky, *Sketches on Byzantine History*, Part I, Moskow 1917 (Russian), 237 ff. Ouspensky's book on the history of the Iconoclasm, to which he refers, seems never to have been published.

ing" in the dispute and that the whole controversy was "concerned with anything but philosophical speculation."² Byzantium was supposed to have been spiritually dead and exhausted long before the Iconoclastic controversy arose, and the conflict itself was merely a symptom of sterility of the Byzantine Church. A kind of deadlock had been reached in her development. "Intellectual curiosity was practically dead. On the Orthodox side there is scarcely a sign of it." On the other hand, Iconoclasm "was in itself of little importance intellectually."³ The Iconoclastic struggle, therefore, should not be interpreted in the perspective of the great doctrinal conflicts of the preceding centuries; the old Christological heresies had been condemned and were dead issues by that time. Their ghosts were invoked in the Iconoclastic dispute just for the sake of polemical efficiency.⁴ And finally, it is contended that we should not dig out these corpses again.

In the light of the recent research, these arbitrary statements are hopelessly old-fashioned and out of date. The theological setting of the whole dispute has been rediscovered and reestablished by impartial scholars beyond any reasonable doubt. It is enough to quote the studies of George Ostrogorsky, Gerhart B. Ladner and, especially, Lucas Koch, O.S.B.⁵ Most modern scholars now recognize that the true problem under discussion was specifically religious, and that both parties were wrestling with real theological problems. The Iconoclastic debate was not simply ecclesiastical or ritualistic; it was a doctrinal controversy. Some ultimate issues of faith and belief were

2 Henri Grégoire, in *Byzantium*, edited by Norman H. Baynes and H. St. L. B. Moss (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), 105. All articles in this volume were written before the war.

3 E. J. Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (London: S.P.C.K., s.d.), 3-4.

4 Grégoire, *Byzantium* (1948), 105.

5 G. Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*, Breslau, 1929 (*Historische Untersuchungen*, Hf. 5); "Connection of the question of the Holy Icons with the Christological dogma," *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, I (1927); "Gnoseological presuppositions of the Byzantine controversy about the Holy Icons," *Ibidem*, II (1928)—both articles in Russian; "Les débuts de la Querelle des Images," *Mélanges Diehl*, vol. I, Paris, 1930; G. Ladner, "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunstlehren der byzantinischen und abendländischen Theologie," *Zeitschrift für die Kirchengeschichte*, B. 50 (1931); "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *Mediaeval Studies*, II (1940), Sheed & Ward; P. Lucas Koch, "Zur Theologie der Christus-ikone," in "Benediktinische Monatschrift," *Beuron*, XIX (1937): 11/12; XX (1928), 1/2, 5/6, 7/8; "Christusbild-Kaiserbild," *Ibidem*, XXI (1939), 3/4.

at stake. It was a real struggle for "Orthodoxy." St. John of Damascus, the Patriarch Nicephorus and St. Theodore of Studium were indeed true theologians, and not just controversialists or ecclesiastical schemers. It is very instructive that a close study of the works of Nicephorus (a large part of which is still unpublished) has compelled J. D. Andreev to revise and reverse his earlier interpretation of the Iconoclastic controversy. He began his studies in the mood of Paparrigopoulo, but ended with a firm conviction that Iconoclasm was an integral phasis of the great Christological dispute, that Patriarch Nicephorus was a "mighty exponent of the Greek genius." Unfortunately, Andreev's book was never published and his manuscript, which was ready for the printer, seems to have been lost.⁶

This new conclusion should not deny or minimize the political and social aspects of the conflict. But these aspects are to be viewed in proper perspective. All doctrinal movements in the Early Church (and possibly, all doctrinal and philosophical movements) were, in some sense, "politically involved" and had political and social implications, and even Monotheism itself was "a political problem."⁷ Yet, by no means were they just an ideological superstructure over a political or economic foundation. In the Iconoclastic conflict the political strife itself had a very definite theological connotation and the "Caesaro-papalism" of the Iconoclastic emperors was itself a kind of theological doctrine.⁸ Iconoclasm was, no doubt, a complex phenomenon. Various groups were associated with the movement, and their purposes and concerns, their motives and aims, were by no means identical. Probably, there was no real agreement inside the Iconoclastic party itself, if there was a party at all or, at least, one particular party. As matter of fact, we know there was considerable disagreement. And therefore, the recovery of a theological setting or perspective does not settle all problems at once. It brings, rather, some new problems to the fore. We have to admit frankly that our knowledge of the epoch is still very inadequate and incomplete.

6 A brief note on Andreev's unpublished work has been given in the *Russian Historical Journal* (probably by V. Beneshevich), VII (Petrograd, 1921), 215-218 (in Russian).

7 This is the title of an admirable booklet by Eric Peterson, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem* (1935).

8 Cf. Lucas Koch, *Christusbild*, etc.—The author uses extensively the book of André Grabar, *L'Empereur dans l'art Byzantin* (Paris, 1936).

There is here still much to be done before we could attempt an inclusive historical synthesis. Even the major theological documents of the epoch have not yet been properly studied. We have no reliable book on the theology of St. Theodore of Studium, and no monograph at all on St. Patriarch Nicephorus. And much of the available information has been overlooked or misinterpreted, owing to certain prejudices and presuppositions, which were never seriously scrutinized.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that, on the whole, we know and understand the position of the Iconodules much better than the theology of the Iconoclasts. The theological contentions and aspirations of the defenders of the Holy Icons are, more or less, clear and comprehensible. They were plainly stated and summarized by the prominent writers of the time. We know what they stood for and what they opposed, and what their reasons were.⁹ The theological position of the Iconoclasts, on the contrary, is still rather obscure. Of course, this is due primarily to the scarcity of information. Our documentation is fragmentary and scanty. The original writings of the Iconoclasts were almost completely destroyed by their antagonists and are to be reconstructed only upon the evidence of their enemies. To some extent this has been done.¹⁰ Still we do not know, exactly, what was the starting point of the Iconoclastic argument nor the real perspective of that argument. This missing perspective usually has been supplied by the conjecture of historians, as it were, by analogy. Judaic or Moslem hatred and repudiation of sacred images, on one hand, and the later Puritanical condemnation of the sacred art, on the other, seemed to provide a relevant analogy, especially because there were parallel movements of a similar type in other contexts, almost contemporaneous with the Iconoclastic outburst in Byzantium. The main problem for a historian, however, is this: what was the main inspiration of those Church groups, which committed themselves to the Iconoclastic cause? It would be a precarious endeavour to use analogy, before this first question is settled. It is a gratuitous assumption, and a too easy solution, if we simply suggest (as it had been so often

⁹ The best presentation of the Orthodox theory of icons is in the articles of P. Lucas Koch.

¹⁰ See B. M. Melioransky, *Georgij Kyprianin i Ioann Jerusalimskij, dva maloizvestnykh borza za pravoslavie v 8 vickie* (St. Petersburg, 1901); and Ostrogorsky, *Studien*.

done) that they were led mainly by the desire to please the Emperor.¹¹ This assumption does not do full justice to the obvious facts. Bishops, as we know, did not go as far as some politicians, and yet they seemed to be quite sincerely against the Iconodulia. Even Kopronymos had to justify his policy and convictions by theological arguments, obviously, not so much to impress his opponents, as to make a convincing appeal to his prospective supporters, and he had to speak their idiom, even if it was not his own, i.e. even if his main reason was not ultimately a theological one. And we know that the pseudo-council of 754 did not follow the Emperor's lead completely.¹²

It is not the purpose of this paper to make an attempt at synthesis. Its scope and purpose is very modest and limited. I am going to bring to the fore some neglected evidences and suggest some fresh lines of research. It is to be a programme of study, not a report on achievements. We shall begin with a concrete question: What was the main authority of the Iconoclasts? It was an appeal to antiquity, and this was possibly the strongest point both of their attack and of their self-defense. It was a double appeal to the Scripture and Tradition. It is usual, in modern interpretation, to give priority to their scriptural proof. Their patristic references were rather neglected. They seemed to be less instructive and convincing. But in the eighth and ninth centuries the patristic proofs would carry full weight. It seems to me, we should have given much more attention to these references, not to pass a judgment on the fight, but to ascertain the reasons and aims of the contending parties.

First of all, some few comments on the scriptural proofs will not be out of place. The Old Testament prohibition of images comes first, and the defenders of the Icons themselves gave much attention to this point. They re-interpreted in many ways this Old Testament witness. Yet, can we be sure, that it was the real focus of the debate, and was it not rather a

11 Cf., e.g., A. Vasiliev, *Histoire de l'Empire Byzantine* (Paris: Picard, 1932), I, 379: "*Quant au parti de la cour et au haut clergé, on peut dire que ces fonctionnaires du gouvernement et évêques n'obéirent pas pour la plupart aux ordres de leur conscience, mais qu'ils professèrent les doctrines qui s'harmonisaient avec leurs craintes et leurs ambitions.*" This view is widespread in the literature.

12 This point has been emphasized by H. Grégoire in his review of Ostrogorsky's "*Studien*," in *Byzantion*, IV, 765-771.

borrowing from other literary sources? What I mean, is simply this: there was a controversy between Jews and Christians, on that very point immediately before the outbreak of the Iconoclastic movement in the Byzantine Church. Obviously, in this controversy the Old Testament witness had to have an indisputable priority. We have every reason to admit that in this debate the Christian apologists developed some standard arguments and compiled some patristic *testimonia* to vindicate the Christian position.¹³ We have no direct evidence to prove that the internecine strife within the Church was an organic continuation of the earlier Judaeo-Christian controversy. Yet, of course, it was quite natural for both sides to use or apply the readily available arguments and "proofs." But was this really the point of the Byzantine controversy? Usually, the whole Iconoclastic argument is reconstructed as a "Semitic" objection against the "Hellenistic" re-paganization of the Church. Iconoclasm then appears to be merely Oriental resistance to a more or less acute Hellenization of Christianity. We have to concede that, in some respects, it is a very plausible hypothesis.¹⁴ Iconoclasm was born in the Orient, and its first promoters were Phrygian bishops (Constantine of Nacoleia and Thomas of Claudiopolis). Yet, let us not overlook the strange fact that their names completely disappear in the later documents—probably because they would not appeal too much to the new strata which were sustaining the Iconoclastic cause in its later phase.¹⁵ Again, the Iconoclastic movement in Byzantium was preceded by a persecution of a similar character in the Caliphate. Still, no direct link with the Moslem opposition has been detected—there was no more than a parallel-

13 Cf. F. Vernet, "Juifs (Controverses avec les)," in *D. T. C.*, VIII, 2, c. 1878 s.; and Sirarpie der Nersessian "Une Apologie des images du septième siècle," in *Byzantion*, XVII (1944-1945). See also J. B. Frey, "La question des images chez les Juifs," in *Biblica*, XV (1934).

14 It is a commonplace in the literature. See, in recent times, Christopher Dawson, *The Making of Europe* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1946 (1932), 136: "It has behind it, not the explicit doctrines of a theological school but the vague and formless spirit of an oriental sectarianism which rejected the whole system of Hellenic dogma." Cf. George Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204* (London: S.P.C.K., 1946), 105: "The Iconoclastic schisms of 730-86 and 815-43 were not the schisms between East and West, but between an Asiatic party at Constantinople and the Greek and Latin party in Greece, Italy and Rome."

15 Cf. Ostrogorsky, *Mélanges Diehl*, p. 236: "Le rôle, joué au début de la querelle des images par le clergé iconoclaste d'Asie Mineure, tombe dans l'oubli dans les siècles suivants." See also Melioransky, *Georgij Kyprianin*.

ism and "analogy."¹⁶ Even the defenders of an Oriental inspiration concede that the role of the Orientals in the later development of the struggle was *null*.¹⁷ On the other hand, the first theologian of the Icons emerged in the East, in a Moslem environment, and St. John of Damascus was by no means an exceptional figure. We should not forget also that, at least in the later period of the struggle, the Iconoclastic cause was popular in the Hellenized quarters, in the court circles, and in the army, whereas in the lower classes it never had flourished, even if there are recorded some cases of violence among the masses. This observation was made by Schwartzlose.¹⁸ Even if the initial impetus came from the Orient and from the masses, the movement grew rapidly on Greek soil and was supported mostly by the learned. This was the main reason for Paparrigopoulo to construe Iconoclasm into an early system of Enlightenment. In any case, we have to warn ourselves against easy generalizations. The situation seems to have been more complicated than an Oriental hypothesis can explain. It remains to determine precisely, why and how the Iconoclasm could appeal to the higher clergy and other intellectuals in Byzantium. They were the opponents with whom Nicephorus and Theodore had to debate the issue. The subservience and opportunism of these men is not an explanation. It simply explains away an unwelcome question. It has been customary to look for the "sources" of the Iconoclasm in the most remote quarters: Judaism, Islam, Paulicianists and other Oriental heresies.¹⁹ But Hellenistic precedents or "sources" have been overlooked or ignored.

Let us turn now to the patristic references of the Iconoclastic party. Most of them are colourless and irrelevant—detached phrases taken out of their original context. There are only two references which are of importance and can substantiate a theological thesis. First, a letter of Eusebius of

16 Cf. J. M. Sweetman, *Islam and Christian Theology*, P. I, v. I, Lutterworth Press, London & Redhill, 1945, p. 63.: "One would rather see in this movement something parallel to Islam" etc.

17 Cf. Vasiliev, *Histoire*, 380.

18 Karl Schwartzlose, *Der Bilderstreit* (Gotha, 1890), 77-78.

19 In any case Paulicians were invoked in vain, for it is most doubtful, whether they had any iconoclastic tendencies, as much as that would have agreed with their dualistic presuppositions. See Henri Grégoire, in *Atti del V Congresso internazionale di Studi Bizantini* (Roma, 1939), 177; and recently D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge, 1949), 53.

Caesarea to Constantia Augusta. Secondly, quotations from Epiphanius or "Epiphanides" or Pseudo-Epiphanius, if we have to agree with Ostrogorsky on the point of the authorship. The witness of Epiphanius was discussed extensively by Holl and Ostrogorsky, and we can leave it aside in the present study. We have, however, to remember that, for Holl, the witness of Epiphanius (which he regarded as authentic) was a proof of a dogmatic connotation of the whole problem of Images, as early as the fourth century.²⁰ The evidence of Eusebius, strangely enough, was never given much attention. It has been often quoted, but never properly analyzed. There is no reason whatsoever to question its authenticity.²¹ It seems to be the key-argument in the whole system of the Iconoclastic reasoning. It was hardly an accident that St. Nicephorus felt compelled to write a special "Antirrheticus" against Eusebius. The name of Eusebius demands attention for another reason: the whole Iconoclastic conception of the Imperial power and authority in the Church goes back to Eusebius. There was an obvious trend of archaism in the Iconoclastic policy.

The letter of Eusebius is not preserved in full. Some parts of it were quoted and discussed at the Council of Nicea and again by Nicephorus, and all excerpts available were put together by Boivin and published for the first time in the notes to his edition of Nicephorus Gregoras' *History* (1702). The text has been reproduced several times since, and a critical edition is badly wanted.²² This time, however, we are not concerned with the exact reading.

20 See Karl Holl, "Die Schriften des Epiphanius gegen die Bilderverehrung" (1916), in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1928), II, 351-387, and Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 61 ff.

21 Holl, 387, n. I. "An der Echtheit des Briefes hat nur Befangenschaft zweifeln können. Sprache, Standpunkt, Auffassung stimmen ganz mit dem unangefochtenen Eusebius überein. Wäre das Schreiben in einem späteren Jahrhundert gefälscht so müsste die dogmatische Begründung schärfer gefasst sein."

22 Excerpts from the Letter of Eusebius read at the Nicaenum II (787): Mansi, XIII, c. 314 or Harduin IV, 406; an enlarged text (following cod. Reg. 1980) was published by Boivin (Nic. Gregoras, *Hist. Byz.* XIX, 3, 4 (reprinted in Migne, S.Gr. CXLIX and in C. S. H. B., Bd. XIX. 2); Card. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, I, 383-386 (as cap. 9 of Nicephorus *Antirrheticus contra Eusebium*); see also inter opera Eusebii—Migne, S. Gr. XX, c. 1545-1549, and in Kirsch, *Enchiridion*, n. 471. Cf. Hugo Koch, *Die altchristliche Bilderfrage nach den literarischen Quellen* (Göttingen 1917; F.R.L.A.N.T., Neue Folge 10); W. Elliger, *Die Stellung der alten Christen zu den Bildern in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten* (Ficker's Studien über Christliche Denkmäler, Hf. 20; Leipzig 1930).

The letter cannot be accurately dated. It was a reply to Constantia Augusta, a sister of Constantine. She had asked Eusebius to send her an "image of Christ." He was astonished. What kind of an image did she mean? Nor could he understand why she should want one. Was it a true and unchangeable image, which would have in itself Christ's character? Or was it the image he had assumed when he took upon himself, for our sake, the form of a servant? The first, Eusebius remarks, is obviously inaccessible to man; only the Father knows the Son. The form of a servant, which he took upon himself at the Incarnation, has been amalgamated with his Divinity. After his ascension into heaven he had changed that form of a servant into the splendour which, by an anticipation, he had revealed to his disciples (at the Transfiguration) and which was higher than a human nature. Obviously, this splendour cannot be depicted by the lifeless colours and shades. The Apostles could not look at him. If even in his flesh there was such a power, what is to be said of him now, when he had transformed the form of a servant into the glory of the Lord and God? Now he rests in the unfathomable bosom of the Father. His previous form has been transfigured and transformed into that splendour ineffable that passes the measure of any eye or ear. No image of this new "form" is conceivable, if "this deified and intelligible substance" can still be called a "form." We cannot follow the example of the pagan artists who would depict things that cannot be depicted, and whose pictures are therefore without any genuine likeness. Thus, the only available image would be just an image in the state of humiliation. Yet, all such images are formally prohibited in the Law, nor are any such known in the churches. To have such images would have meant to follow the way of the idolatrous pagans. We, Christians, acknowledge Christ as the Lord and God, and we are preparing ourselves to contemplate him as God, in the purity of our hearts. If we want to anticipate this glorious image, before we meet him face to face, there is but one Good Painter, the Word of God himself. The main point of this Eusebian argument is clear and obvious. Christians do not need any artificial image of Christ. They are not permitted to go back; they must look forward. Christ's "historical" image, the "form" of his humiliation, has been

already superseded by his Divine splendour, in which he now abides. This splendour cannot be seen or delineated, but, in due time, true Christians will be admitted into that glory of the age to come. It would be superfluous for our present purpose to collate the parallels from the other writings of Eusebius.²³

This testimony of Eusebius was disavowed by the Orthodox and rejected as heretical, as betraying his impious errors. It was emphasized that Eusebius was an Arian. We would phrase this charge somewhat differently. Eusebius was an Origenist, and his letter to Constantia was composed in an Origenistic idiom. Now, we have to ask this question: was the letter of Eusebius just an accidental reference discovered (by the Iconoclasts), *post factum*, and brought forward, along with many others, to vindicate a thesis that had been formulated quite independently? Or, do we have here one of the original sources of the Iconoclastic inspiration, at least in its later theological form? Should we not explain the obvious popularity of the Iconoclastic bias among the learned bishops and clergy (whom it would be ridiculous to associate with either the Moslems, Paulicianists, or other obvious heretics) on the basis of their Origenistic leaning? To do this, of course, one would have to go through the list of all the bishops and clergy concerned and ascertain to what extent this suggestion could be substantiated in each particular case. We are speaking now especially of the prelates present at the Iconoclastic pseudo-councils of 754 and 815. This inquiry cannot, however, be undertaken in the present preliminary study. In any case, Origenism was by no means a dead issue by that time. Origen's spiritual ideal, through Evagrius and St. Maximus the Confessor, was integrated into the current Orthodox synthesis. For St. Maximus himself, Origenism was still a living theology and he had to wrestle with its problems and shortcomings quite in earnest. It is not yet quite certain, whether he had actually overcome all of them.²⁴ This was but a century before the outbreak of the Iconoclasm. The Orient especially was infected by Origenistic ideas of all sorts. It is true, the name of Origen was never mentioned in the Iconoclastic de-

23 See H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Amsterdam, 1939).

24 See Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Liturgie Cosmique, Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris: Aubier, 1947); or the German edition (Freiburg i/Br.: Herder, 1941).

bate, and Nicephorus treated Eusebius simply as an Arian and does not mention Origen. We are not concerned at this point, however, with what Nicephorus had to say against Eusebius.²⁵ The Origenistic character of the letter in question is beyond doubt. Obviously, the Iconoclasts would have condemned themselves, if they had dared to claim for themselves the authority of Origen. Yet, the whole tenor and ethos of Origenism was undoubtedly favorable to that course of theological reasoning which was actually adopted by the Iconoclasts. Therefore, the defense of the Holy Icons was, in some sense, an indirect refutation of Origenism, a new act in the story of the "Origenistic controversies."

First of all, Origen's Christology was utterly inadequate and ambiguous. The whole set of his metaphysical presuppositions made it very difficult for him to integrate the Incarnation, as an unique historical event, into the general scheme of Revelation. Everything historical was for him but transitory and accidental. Therefore the historical Incarnation had to be regarded only as a moment in the continuous story of permanent Theophany of the Divine Logos—a central moment, in a sense, but still no more than a central symbol. In the perspective of a continuous Divino-cosmic process there was no room for a true historical uniqueness, for an ultimate decision, accomplished in time, by one major event. No event could, in this perspective, have an ultimate meaning or value by itself as an event. All events were to be interpreted as symbols or projections of some higher, super-temporal and super-historical, reality. The historical was, as it were, dissolved into the symbolic. Now, a symbol is no more than a sign, pointing to a beyond, be it eternity or "the age to come," or both at once. The whole system of symbols was something provisional, to be ultimately done away. One had to penetrate behind the screen of symbols. This was the major exegetical principle or postulate of Origen. The exegetical method of Origen, by whatever name we may label it, was meant precisely for that ultimate purpose—to transcend history, to go beyond the veil of events, beyond the "letter" which would inevitably kill even under the New Dispensation of Grace, no less than *sub umbraculo legis*. The reality or historicity of the events

25 Pitra, *Spicilegium*, I, 371-504.

was not denied, but they were to be interpreted as hints and signs and symbols. It would be an obvious injustice, if we imputed to Origen a neglect of history, of the "historic Jesus" and him Crucified. As Bigg has aptly remarked: "the Cross in all its wonder, its beauty, its power, was always before the eyes of Origen."²⁶ This symbolism of Origen had nothing docetical about it. Yet, the "historic Cross" of Jesus was for Origen just a symbol of something higher. Only the *simpliciores*, "who are still children," could be satisfied, in Origen's opinion, with the "somatic" sense of the Scripture, which is but "a shadow of the mysteries of Christ," just as the Law of old had been a shadow of good things to come. The more advanced are concerned with the truth itself, i.e. with the "Eternal Gospel" (or a "Spiritual" Gospel), of which the historic Gospel or Evangel is but an enigma and shadow. Origen emphatically distinguishes and contrasts an "external" and a "hidden" Christianity. He admits, it is true, that one has to be at once "somatic" and "pneumatic," but only for educational reasons and purposes. One has to tell the "fleshly" Christians that he does not know anything but Christ Jesus and Him Crucified. "But should we find those who are perfected in the spirit, and bear fruit in it, and are enamoured of the heavenly wisdom, these must be made to partake of that Word which, after it was made flesh, rose again to what it was in the beginning, with God." Ultimately, we have to "transform" the "sensual" Evangelium into the "spiritual;"²⁷ that is to say that the New Testament is to be interpreted in the same manner as the Old—as an anticipation. This basic orientation towards the future, towards that what is to come, implies a definite devaluation of the past, of that which had already happened. It implies also an ultimate levelling of the whole temporal process, which is but natural since everything temporal is but a symbol of the eternal, and at any point one can break into the eternal. The whole "allegorical" or rather symbolical method of interpretation implies a certain equality of the two historical dispensations: they are both, in an ultimate sense, but provisional, and should be interpreted as such. Both

²⁶ Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*.

²⁷ In Jo. Comm., I. 9 and 10; cf. in Matt. Comm. XVI. 20 and 24; See also C. Cels. II. 62: "God the Word was sent, indeed, as a physician to sinners, but as a teacher of divine mysteries to those who are already pure and who sin no more."

are but "shadows," if in a different sense. And Origen concludes, therefore, that in the Old Testament the whole truth was already available for the advanced. The prophets and the sages of the Old Dispensation have actually seen and known more and better than "somatics" in the Church, "and could see better than we can the realities of which (the happenings of their times) were the shadows." They have seen the glory of Christ, the image of the invisible God, "advanced from the introduction they had in types to the vision of truth." He dwells at length on this topic and concludes: "those who were made perfect in earlier generations knew not less than the Apostles did of what Christ revealed to them, since the same teacher was with them as He who revealed to the Apostles the unspeakable mysteries of godliness." The only advantage of the Apostles was that "in addition to knowing these mysteries, they saw the power at work in the accomplished fact."²⁸ The allegorical method was first invented in order to interpret the promise. It could not suit the new purpose: a Christian exegete had to interpret an achievement. In other words, a Christian allegorist was approaching the Gospel as if it were still nothing more than the Law; he approached the New Testament as if it were still the Old; he approached the achievement as if it were but a promise. There was indeed a further promise in the achievement, yet the fact of the accomplishment should not have been disregarded. And it was at that point that the "allegorical" method was bound to fail. We may describe the allegorical method as "Judaic," i.e. as an approach to the Gospel in the spirit of Prophecy. Of course, this "Judaism" was in no sense "Semitic;" it was a typical Hellenistic approach. "For the mere letter and narrative of the events which happened to Jesus do not present the whole view of the truth. For each one of them can be shown, to those who have an intelligent apprehension of Scripture, to be a symbol of something else." We have to ascend from the narratives themselves to the things which they symbolized.²⁹ The story or narrative is but a starting point. One begins with Jesus of the Gospel, with Him the Crucified, but his aim should be to arrive at the vision of the Divine glory. The humanity of Jesus is

²⁸ In Jo. I. 24.

²⁹ In Jo. VI. 2; cf. C. Cels. II. 69 and in Jo. X. 4.

but the first and lowest step of our spiritual understanding, which is to be transcended.³⁰

In fact, we have to deal here not only with the steps and degrees of interpretation. Jesus himself has transcended the state of his humiliation, which had been superseded and, as it were, abrogated by the state of his glorification. His humanity has not been laid aside, yet it was exalted to a higher perfection, in an intimate blending with his divinity.³¹ This is strong language indeed. "And truly, after his resurrection, he existed in a body intermediate, as it were, between the grossness of that he had before his sufferings, and the appearance of a soul uncovered by such a body." And therefore, after his resurrection, Jesus simply could not appear to the people "in the same manner as before that event." Even in the days of his flesh he "was more things than one," i.e. he had no standing appearance, "nor was he seen in the same way by all who beheld him." His external outlook depended upon the measure of ability to receive him. His glorious transfiguration on the Mount was but one instance of the adaptability of his body. "He did not appear the same person to the sick, and to those who needed his healing aid, and to those who were able by reason of their strength to go up the mountain along with him."³² These varying appearances of Jesus are to be referred to the nature of the Word, who does not show himself in the same way, or indifferently, to all, but to the unprepared would appear as one "who has neither form nor beauty" (to the "sons of men") and to those who can ascend with him in a "surpassing loveliness."³³

As strange and forbidding as this interpretation may seem to be, it has been preserved in the tradition up to the later ages. We find it, for example, in St. Maximus. He speaks of the mystical experience, but his phrasing is almost a literal quotation from Origen. The Lord does not appear to all in his present glory, but to those who are still under way he comes in the form of a servant, and to those who are capable to follow him up to the mountain of his transfiguration he would appear in the form of God, in which he existed before the world began.³⁴

30 In Jo. XIX. I.

31 C. Cels. III. 41.

32 C. Cels. II. 64; cf. in Matt. II. 6 and XII. 30 & 36.

33 C. Cels. VI. 77; cf. IV. 16, 18.

34 S. Maxim. Cap. theol. II, 13, Migne S. Gr. XC, 1129-1132.

For Origen, even in the days of the earthly life of Christ, his body was "an altogether miraculous body."³⁵ After the resurrection it was assumed into his divinity, and could no more be distinguished from it.^{35a} "*Ideo omnia quod est in Christo jam nunc Filius Dei est.*"³⁶ If he was truly man, he is now man no more, and therefore we also are no more men when we follow his words, for he, as the *prototokos* of all men, has transformed us into God.³⁷ "*Si autem Deus est qui quondam homo fuit, et oportet te illi similem fieri, 'quando similes ejus fuerimus, et viderimus eum sicut est' (I Jo. 3:2), te quoque necesse erit Deum fieri, in Christo Jesu.*"³⁸ For our immediate purpose, there is no need to go into any further detail. The main contention of Origen is clear. And we could not fail to observe the close and intimate resemblance between Origen's ideas and those in the letter of Eusebius to Constantia. Origen's Christology was the background and presupposition of Eusebius. He drew legitimate conclusions from the principles laid down by Origen. If one walks in the steps of Origen, would he, really, be interested in any "historical" image or "ikon" of the Lord? What could be depicted was already overcome and superseded, and the true and glorious reality of the Risen Lord escapes any depiction or description. Moreover, from the Origenist point of view, the true face of the Lord could hardly be depicted even in the days of his flesh, but only his image accommodated to the capacity of a "somatic" and "fleshly" man, which "appearance" was in no sense his true and adequate image. Of course, Origen himself was not concerned with the pictorial images. Yet, what he had to say against the pagan images could be very easily used against the icons.³⁹ Again, there was

35 C. Cels. I. 33.

35a In Jo. XXXII. 17; cf. C. Cels. II.9.

36 In Rom. Comm. 1.6.

37 In Jer. hom. XVI. 6.

38 In Luc. hom. XXIX: *nunc autem homo esse cessavit.*

39 See especially C. Cels. VIII. 17 and 18: "in all those, then, who plant and cultivate within their souls, according to the divine word, temperance, justice, wisdom, piety, and other virtues, these excellences are the statues they raise, in which we are persuaded that it is becoming for us to honour the model and the prototype of all statues: 'the image of the invisible God,' God the Only-begotten . . . And everyone who imitates Him according to his ability, does by this very endeavour raise a statue according to the image of the Creator, for in the contemplation of God with a pure heart they become imitators of Him. And in general, we see that all Christians strive to raise altars and statues as we have described them, and these not of a lifeless and senseless kind," etc. Cf. Elliger, *Die Stellung*, 41 ff.

an obvious parallelism between the two problems: the problem of the Scripture and the problem of pictorial representation. It was the same problem of "description." We know that this was a major topic of the whole Iconoclastic controversy. St. John of Damascus had clearly seen the connection of the two topics and problems: Scripture itself is "an image."⁴⁰ If we apply the exegetical method of Origen to the problem of the artistic and pictorial "description," we shall have at least to hesitate. Possibly, we would have no difficulty in accepting "symbolic" representations, just as the Bible is to be taken as a book of symbols, which, by their very nature, compel us to go beyond. But, surely, we shall be most seriously embarrassed by a "historical" image. This was exactly what had happened at the Iconoclastic pseudo-councils in 754 and 815. The very point of their argument was this: they felt very strongly the utter disproportion between all historical ("sensual") images and the "state of glory" in which both Christ and his saints were already abiding. One instance will suffice: was it permissible, so asked the Iconoclastic bishops in 754, to depict the saints, who already shine in the glory ineffable, and to recall them thereby again to earth?⁴¹

The Iconoclasm was not just an indiscriminate rejection of any art. There was a wide variety of opinion among the opponents of the icons. Yet, in the main, it was rather a resistance to one special kind of religious art, namely the icon-painting, an "icon" being a representation of a true historical person, be it our Lord or a saint. This type of Christian art was growing at that time. Its birth-place was probably in Syria, and its distinctive mark was, as Louis Bréhier put it recently, "*la recherche naïve de la vérité historique*"—a special emphasis on the historic truth.⁴² One of the favorite subjects was the Crucified Christ. It was not necessarily a "naturalism," but it was bound to be some sort of a historic realism. This was the main contention of the new trend. A true "icon" claimed to be something essentially different from a "symbol." It had to be a "representation" of something real, and a true and accurate representation. A true icon had to be, in the last resort, a historic picture. This accounts for the stability of the

40 St. John of Damascus, *De imaginibus*, III.

41 Mansi, XII, 277 D.

42 Louis Bréhier, in *Histoire de l'Église*, by Fliehe & Martin, V, 442.

iconographic types in the East: there is no room for an artistic "invention." The iconographic types belong to tradition, and are stabilized by the authority of the Church. Only the execution belongs to the artist. Thus was it formulated at Nicaenum II.⁴³ The final appeal is not to an artistic imagination or to an individual vision, but to history,—to things seen and testified. In this connection, canon 82 of the Council in Trullo (691-692) is illustrative. It deals directly only with one particular case (the immediate circumstances of the decision are uncertain), but, at least by implication, it establishes a general principle too. The Council forbids a symbolic representation of Christ as a Lamb. Apparently, the Council was objecting to a semi-historical scene: St. John the Baptist pointing to the coming Christ, and Christ represented symbolically. The reasons for prohibition are highly instructive. The lamb is a "typos," or an "image" or figure of the coming Grace, which signifies the very Lamb, Christ. Now, the old "types" and "shadows," i.e. symbols and signs, must be respected. Yet, priority belongs to "grace" and "truth," which is the fulness of the Law. The Council prescribes that Christ should be represented or depicted as man, instead of the "ancient lamb," in remembrance of His incarnation, passion and redeeming death, and of the universal redemption, thereby accomplished.⁴⁴ It is much more than an ordinary canonical regulation, it is a doctrinal statement and pronouncement. It is a doctrinal programme, a true preamble to all subsequent literature on the Holy Icons. Strangely enough, this canon was completely overlooked by the historians of the Iconoclasm. The case, to which the Council refers, seems to be very special. But the canon lays down a principle. There must have been some reason for that. What is remarkable, is that the painting of icons is emphatically linked with the relation between the "types" and the (historic) "truth," or possibly between the two Testaments. We touch again upon an exegetical problem. All ancient "types" are already over, the Truth had come, Christ, the Incarnate and Crucified. It was a solemn approbation and encouragement of the new "historical" art. The phrasing seems to be deliberate. An emphasis on the "human form" of Christ was quite natural at the time when the last Christological controversy had been

⁴³ Mansi, XIII, 252.

⁴⁴ Ed. Alivisatos (Athens, 1924), 121.

in the process of being settled. It directs the painter's attention to the historical achievement.

It is commonly agreed that theological defense of the Holy Icons, especially by St. Theodore, but earlier by St. John of Damascus, had been based on Neo-platonic presuppositions. The whole conception of the "prototype" and the "image" (reflection on a lower level) was platonic. On the whole, this statement is obviously fair. Yet, it needs a qualification. In any case, the argument includes an open reference to the (historic) Incarnation. The Iconodules were not speaking simply of "images" of some "eternal" or "heavenly" realities. They were speaking precisely of the "images" of some "earthly" realities, as it were, of historic personalities, who lived in time on earth. And this makes a difference.

At this moment, we are not concerned with the doctrine of the Iconodules. Let us admit that they were platonic or rather pro-platonic. Unfortunately, it has been overlooked that there was, in Neo-platonism, an obvious Iconoclastic tendency as well. Porphyrius, in his "Life of Plotinus," tells us that Plotinus, it seemed, "was ashamed to be in the flesh," and it is precisely with that statement that Porphyrius begins his biography. "And in such a frame of mind he refuses to speak either of his ancestors or parents, or of his fatherland. He would not sit for a sculptor or painter." Should one make a permanent image of this perishable frame? It was enough that one is compelled to bear it.⁴⁵ Plotinus would gladly forget that he had an earthly biography, parents or fatherland. The philosophical aspiration of Plotinus must be carefully distinguished from an "Oriental" asceticism, Gnostic or Manichean. Plotinus was not a dualist. Yet, his practical conclusion was still that we should "retreat" from this corporeal world and escape the body. Plotinus himself suggested the following analogy. Two men live in the same house. One of them blames the builder and his handiwork, because it is made of inanimate wood and stone. The other praises the wisdom of the architect, because the building is so skillfully erected. For Plotinus this world is not evil, it is the "image" or reflection of the world above, and perhaps the best of all images. Still, one has to aspire beyond all images, from the image to the prototype,

⁴⁵ Porphyrius, *Vita Plotini*, I.

from the lower to the higher world, and Plotinus praises not the copy, but the pattern or exemplar.⁴⁶ "He knows that when the time comes, he will go out and will no longer have need of any house."⁴⁷ This was why he was unwilling to sit for a painter. The picture of this "perishable frame" could never be his true "image," an image of his immortal self. No picture can ever be taken of the very self of man. And therefore, all pictures are deceiving. They would imprison man's imagination in a "perishable frame." Now, is not this admirable passage of Plotinus a good introduction to the Iconoclastic mind? A Christian would, of course, put the whole problem a bit differently. Possibly, instead of a "world above" he would speak of the "age to come." Yet, to the same effect. Origen, at least, was not so far from Plotinus at this point. It is interesting to notice that among the ancient *testimonia*, collected by the Iconoclasts, there was one of an obvious "platonian" inspiration and of an undoubtedly heretical origin. It was a quotation from the "Acts of St. John." It was an exact parallel to the story told of Plotinus by Porphyrius. A picture was taken of St. John, without his knowledge. He did not approve of it, nor could he recognize at once that it was really his picture, as he had never seen his face in the mirror. After all, it was but a "picture of his body." But man had to be the painter of his soul and to adorn it with faith and other virtues. "This, however, which thou hast made, is childish and imperfect; thou hast painted a dead picture of a dead thing."⁴⁸

It has been usual to interpret the Iconoclastic movement as an Oriental or Semitic reaction and resistance to an excessive Hellenization of Christian art and devotion, to the Hellenistic involvement of the Byzantine Church. But, we find nothing specifically "Semitic" in Iconoclastic theology; both the arguments and the proofs seem to be rather Hellenistic. The Iconoclasts were Platonic to be sure. But was not the Iconoclastic attitude also rather Platonic? And are we not to interpret the whole conflict rather as an inner split within Hellenistic Christianity? Iconoclasm was, of course, a very complex movement and its various components are to be care-

⁴⁶ Plotinus, V.8.8.

⁴⁷ Plotinus, II.15.

⁴⁸ *Acta Joannis*, cap. 28-29; cf. Mansi, XIII, 168. Cf. A. F. Findlay, *Byways in Early Christian Literature* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1923), 214 f. The document is of the second century.

fully analyzed. But the main inspiration of the Iconoclastic thought was Hellenistic. We must reverse the current interpretation. It was Iconoclasm that was a return to the pre-Christian Hellenism. The whole conflict can be interpreted as a new phase of an age-long process. Sometimes it has been styled as an Hellenization of Christianity. It should be described rather as a Christianization of Hellenism. The main feature of the process was obviously the split in the Hellenism or its polarization. In the Iconoclastic controversy,—at least, on its theological level—the two Hellenisms, as several times before, met again in a heated fight. The main issue was between symbolism and history. The Iconoclasts represented in the conflict an un-reformed and uncompromising Hellenic position, of an Origenistic and Platonic trend. It was not an immediate continuation of the Monophysite tradition. Yet, Monophysitism itself, as far as its theology was concerned, was a kind of Hellenism, and its roots go back to the early Alexandrian tradition, and therefore it could be easily amalgamated with Neoplatonism. The Iconodules, on the contrary, stood definitely for the "Historic Christianity." A particular topic was under discussion, but the major issues were at stake. This accounts for the bitterness and violence of the whole struggle. Not only the destiny of Christian Art was at stake, but "Orthodoxy" itself. In any case, the struggle can be understood only in the perspective of an age-long *Auseinandersetzung* between Christianity and Hellenism. Both parties were "Hellenistically-minded." Yet there was a conflict between a Christian Hellenism and an Hellenized Christianity, or possibly between Orthodoxy and Syncretism.⁴⁹

The only contention of this brief essay is to raise the question. More study will be required before an ultimate answer can be given.⁵⁰

49 Cf. the stimulating book of Endra Ivanka, *Hellenisches und Christliches im Frühbyzantinischen Geistesleben* (Wien, 1948). On Iconoclasm see 105 ff.

50 The new and important book by P. Henri De Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit, L' intelligence de l' écriture d' après Origène* (Paris: Aubier, 1950), which is highly relevant for our problem, unfortunately became available to me after this paper was ready for the printer. I have not found there, however, anything to compel me to change my description. See its pertinence to pp. 88-92 of this article.

GEORGE D. HERRON AND THE KINGDOM MOVEMENT

ROBERT T. HANDY

Union Theological Seminary, New York

The story of the Kingdom movement of the 1890's is one of the most important chapters in the history of American social Christianity. In the middle years of the 1890's the Christian social movement really began to exert significant influence upon the American Protestant churches and to modify the character of certain denominations. The Kingdom movement played an important role in the events of these crucial years.

That there were important changes taking place in the thought and action of the churches and that a social interpretation of Christianity was being seriously considered by significant numbers of church people in those years was noticed by certain keen observers at the time. In a review of the year's books, an editor of a prominent religious journal noted that "the year 1894 has been most prolific in the production of books, good, bad, and indifferent, on the subjects most dear to the public heart,—socialism, social reform, sociology, political economy, and social aspects of Christianity."¹ The Chicago correspondent of another prominent periodical remarked that "it seems to be impossible to have any important gathering here without considering some phases of the irrepressible social problem."² In 1894 a gentleman who had not attended the meetings of a certain Congregational association for ten years chanced to attend again, and with great surprise he discovered that the nature of the program had almost totally changed; ecclesiastical and theological questions had given way to social problems.³ A comparison that was made between the topics that were discussed in religious conventions and associational

1 *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LII (1895), 205.

2 Franklin, "From the Interior," *The Congregationalist*, LXXIX (January-June, 1894), 263.

3 "Pointers from Pittsfield," *Ibid.*, 747.

gatherings of all denominations for the year 1894 with those of twenty-five years before showed that topics that had scarcely been mentioned in the earlier period, topics relating to the labor question, the spread of the kingdom of God, the social problem, and the relation of the church to social movements, were dominating religious assemblies by 1894.⁴ The editor of a prominent denominational publication observed that "no other questions interest the modern world more than the social question."⁵ It was in the 1890's that the theological seminaries developed a much greater interest in social problems than they had shown before, so much so that changes in courses of study became significant.⁶ The study of sociology was enjoying immense popularity in ecclesiastical as well as in academic circles; a symposium on the definition of a Christian sociology was contributed to by over a hundred leading church and educational leaders and was followed by great interest and discussion.⁷ The trend of the times was clearly illustrated in this typical announcement:

The Hartford School of Sociology, with President Hartnft of the Hartford Theological Seminary at its head, is soon to open in that city, the lectures and topics for the first year having been already announced. The careful study of social problems is a great need of the times, the wide popular interest in them affords much promise to this proposed graduate school.⁸

This great interest in the social problem on the part of many churches in the middle nineties is significant; it was in this period that the American Protestant churches were first permanently influenced by the Christian social movements that had developed in their midst.

The historical background of this important development

4 "Changes in Religious Thinking," *Ibid.*, LXXIX (July-December, 1894), 580.

5 "The Supremacy of Social Questions," *The Methodist Review*, LXXIX (1897), 453.

6 Cf. James Dombrowski, *The Early Days of Christian Socialism in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), chap. v, 60-73; "The Seminaries Discover a Social Problem"; also see Aaron Ignatius Abell, *The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900* ("Harvard Historical Studies," LIV [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943], chap. ix, 224-45: "Changing Trends in the Seminaries.")

7 Z. Swift Holbrook (ed.), "What Is Sociology?", *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LII (1895), 458-504.

8 "In Brief," *The Congregationalist*, LXXIX (July-December, 1894), 300.

has been surveyed in a number of scholarly works.⁹ Such studies show how rapid industrialization, accelerated urbanization, and increased immigration in post-Civil War America produced perplexing social and economic problems; they demonstrate the importance of labor strife in shaking Protestant complacency; they analyze the liberal theological developments that made new social and ethical insights possible; they discuss the significance of a number of social prophets who were aflame with the message of social justice; they tell the story of progressive and radical movements that influenced the thinking of church people; they trace the course of various Christian social groups and leaders. All these factors played a part in the developing social consciousness of Protestantism. These studies also show in a general way how this deepening social awareness began to influence the churches profoundly in the 1890's. This development was stimulated by the acute social tensions of those years of labor strife (1892-94), financial panic (1893), drouth (1894), and depression (1893-96).

These general studies of the Christian social movement need to be supplemented by more intensive studies of certain periods and aspects of the larger movement. For example, careful study of the 1890's has shown that one of the chief factors in stimulating interest in the concern for social Christianity was the existence of an important socio-religious movement, best known as the "Kingdom movement," in the years 1890-96. It was this movement that confronted the churches with the message of social Christianity in these years of unrest.

The movement centered on the campus of Iowa (now Grinnell) College. Its leading figures were Professor George D. Herron and President George A. Gates. The movement was educative in purpose, for its leaders hoped to awaken the churches

9 Cf. Dombrowski, *Early Days*, Abell, *Urban Impact*, Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915* ("Yale Studies in Religious Education," Vol. XIV [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940], and Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949). All of these works, in one way or another, stress the importance of the 1890's. May carries his study to 1895, Dombrowski and Abell carry theirs to 1900. These dates suggest that the developments that have been traced achieved a degree of success and maturity by then. Hopkins' study goes to 1915, but he entitled Part III of his book "1890-1900: The Social Gospel Comes of Age." J. Neal Hughley, in his critique of the social gospel from a neo-orthodox viewpoint, *Trends in Protestant Social Idealism* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1948), 8, also stresses the importance of the years just preceding 1900.

to a realization of the seriousness of the social issues and to a sense of their social responsibility. Its influence was felt in all the major denominations, though Congregationalism was most affected. Perhaps the best attempt to define the movement was by a contemporary critic, who said:

The distress which has been brought upon many people in our country in connection with the recent serious financial troubles, has furnished an opportune occasion for the exposition of certain new theories affecting property, held by a class of religious leaders who may be characterized by that Scriptural expression most frequently employed by them, namely, "The Kingdom of God." Their company is as yet comparatively small; but its representatives are found throughout Christendom. The scribe of this movement in America is the Rev. Joseph Strong, D.D.; its prophet is the Rev. George D. Herron, D.D.; its apostle is the Rev. B. Fay Mills; while President George A. Gates is by some regarded as its leader. The theories of this class are distinguished by the virtual condemnation of the church as substantially apostate, particularly because of its misuse of property and the selfishness which has developed with the increase of its wealth. The aim of this class, therefore, is the reorganization of society in keeping with what is supposed to be the exact teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ. I have designated Dr. Herron as the prophet of this movement, since his theories have been stated with the utmost confidence, and his demands upon the church urged with the utmost vehemence.¹⁰

President Gates, in explaining what the movement was, said that it was dedicated to the task of recalling a church too often spiritually indolent and respectably conventional to full obedience to Christ, but insisted that it was by no means a divisive movement. He said, "It is a movement wholly within the churches. I do not believe this movement can be forced or drawn into any form of separation."¹¹ He felt that the movement was founded on the truth that the church has social responsibility: "If the church is not responsible for the condition of the world in which it has been for nearly two thousand years charged with the redemption of the world, then who or what is responsible for that condition?"¹² In its early years the movement was looked upon with great hope by some of its adherents. For example, Professor Charles Noble, professor of English at Iowa, said:

The movement was a genuine effort to think out a way of actually applying to social life the principles of the teaching and life of Jesus. . . . I am

10 David R. Breed, "Christian Beneficence and Some Theories Affecting Property," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, V (1894), 287.

11 "The Movement for the Kingdom," *The Kingdom*, VII (1894-95), 3.

12 *Ibid.*

not ashamed to confess that I felt for a time that a really significant movement was started here, which might conceivably amount to a new reformation, leading to a Christian reconstruction of society.¹³

The great concern with social questions evident in the churches in the 1890's and the eventual pervasiveness of the social gospel in many Protestant denominations were in no small measure significantly implemented by the Kingdom movement.

The movement grew out of a little retreat of socially-minded clergymen called together by President Gates at Iowa College in June, 1892. Charles Noble wrote about this retreat in these words:

The movement began before I came to Grinnell in the retreat which was organized at the initiative of President Gates. The first year, a little company of seven: Gates, Herron, Josiah Strong who had become really famous in religious circles by a book called "Our Country," which had a phenomenal circulation and great influence, two Minnesota ministers Mr. West and Mr. Chandler, old acquaintances and brother ministers with Herron when he was a Minnesota pastor, Rev. Mr. Berry of Ottumwa and myself. Not a distinguished company with the exception of Dr. Strong, who at that time might have been called one of the most distinguished ministers among Congregationalists. We met morning and afternoon in the little tower room of Goodnow Hall; listened to chapters of forthcoming books by Dr. Strong in the morning and Herron in the afternoon, discussing the topics freely, and had a very pleasant and profitable time together.¹⁴

These "retreats of the kingdom" met yearly in June for three more years, and though they grew somewhat larger they remained small and intimate groups of leaders. The chief value of the retreats was in clarifying the ideas of the participants and in giving them a sense of fellowship and support in their venturesome undertaking. Under the guidance of Gates and Herron they sought for ways of spreading their social message, and thus the Kingdom movement was born.

George D. Herron had been ordained to the Congregational ministry in 1884 and had served as pastor of a number of small churches. He had little formal education, but had done much reading on his own and had developed an advanced theological

13 "Twenty-Five Years of Grinnell" (unpublished typescript, Grinnell College Library, 1918?), 9 f.

14 *Ibid.*, 9.

and progressive social position.¹⁵ He first became prominent in 1890 when an address before the Minnesota Congregational Club, "The Message of Jesus to Men of Wealth," was published in several forms,¹⁶ arousing much interest and comment. His theme was that civilization was wrongly rooted on principles of self-interest and competition, while it ought to be based on the teachings of Jesus and the law of self-sacrifice. Called to the associate pastorate of the First Congregational Church of Burlington, Iowa, Herron was greatly in demand as a speaker and a writer. He developed his views in a number of sermons and addresses, many of which he published in a series of little books.¹⁷ He felt himself to be especially called for a prophetic task of great importance; he spoke and wrote with colossal self-assurance and passionate intensity. When one of his admiring parishioners, Mrs. E. D. Rand, widow of a wealthy lumber king, offered to endow a "chair of Applied Christianity" for him at Iowa College, President Gates eagerly paved the way for its acceptance, and Herron began his work there in September, 1893.

George A. Gates was a graduate of Dartmouth College and Andover Theological Seminary. He had also studied abroad in Germany, especially under the German idealistic philosopher Lotze.¹⁸ Because he had accepted the critical study of the Bible and the theory of evolution, he was suspected by many of the orthodox. He was refused ordination on his first appearance before a council, and was rejected for foreign mission

15 Brief accounts of Herron's activities and thought can be found in Dombrowski, *Early Days*, 117-93, and Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 184-200. A fuller study of Herron's career as a Christian social leader is my "George D. Herron and the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1890-1901" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949).

16 E.g., cf. *The Christian Union*, XLII (1890), 804-05. The address appeared in pamphlet form (*The Message of Jesus to Men of Wealth* [New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891]) and was reprinted as chap. iv of Herron's *The Christian Society* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1894), 99-122.

17 *The Larger Christ* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891), *A Plea for the Gospel* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1892), *The Call of the Cross: Four College Sermons* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1892), and *The New Redemption: A Call to the Church to Reconstruct Society According to the Gospel of Christ* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1893).

18 For good discussions of Gates, cf. Isabel Smith Gates, *The Life of George Augustus Gates* (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1915); Truman O. Douglass, "Builders of a Commonwealth" (13 vols.; unpublished typescript: original at Iowa State College College, copy at University of Chicago, n. d.), XI, 255-62; John Scholte Nollen "Educational Pioneer; The Centennial History of Grinnell College 1846-1946" (unpublished typescript, Grinnell College, n. d.), 77-99.

work because of doctrinal unsoundness. On his second appearance before an ordination council he passed, and served a brilliant pastorate in Upper Montclair, New Jersey. In 1887 he became president of Iowa College; under his leadership the college developed rapidly, for he wished to keep in step with new developments in scholarship, science, and education. He greatly admired Herron, and said of him:

It is my belief that no man of this generation has uttered the prophetic and witnessing voice of this age in so nearly adequate terms as Mr. Herron has done. I want to make my own confession that among all the men I have ever known there is not one to whom I owe so much inspiration of Christliness, in whom I have found such unswerving loyalty to Jesus, such absolute abandonment of self in the service of the Master, such a consuming passion for righteousness, such clearness of perception of the failures and need of our age, the world and the human race, as I have found in him.¹⁹

Though Herron became the most conspicuous figure in the movement, the importance of Gates must never be underestimated, for much of the success of the movement was because of his administrative skill and his constant encouragement of Herron. Professor Noble observed that "the 'Kingdom' movement inevitably suggests Herron, but the credit of what was good and true in it belongs quite as much to Gates."²⁰

When Herron began his work at Iowa College in 1893, he made a tremendous impression on the campus. He launched out boldly in the work of his new Department of Applied Christianity, endowed by its founder "... for the purpose of developing a social philosophy and economic from the teachings of Jesus; for the application of His teachings to social problems and institutions."²¹ His classes were crowded by students and visitors who came many miles to hear the famous professor. Before two months had passed his classes had to be moved to the college chapel to accommodate the crowds. Joseph H. Chandler visited the college and in reporting on the new department remarked that "with Dr. Herron in the chair, it has become evident that if the lecture-room doors are open to the public ministers will come long distances to hear him and will find lodging in the town, whether the college authorities help or

19 "Movement for the Kingdom," 4.

20 "Twenty-Five Years," 9.

21 *Annual Report of the President of Iowa College, 1898* (Grinnell, 1898), 41.

hinder."²² A group of graduate students gathered about the new professor, eagerly drinking in his teachings. In his classes, Herron developed in detail the same themes that were outlined in his books. He sharply criticized the existing economic and social order, and counseled complete obedience to the teachings of Jesus in all the affairs of life that the kingdom of God might come on earth. He was also active beyond the classroom. He conducted popular evening meetings twice a week, one devoted to Bible study, the other to Christian discipleship. He preached frequently at the college chapel and in nearby churches. The whole atmosphere of the campus was changed by the presence of the prophet-professor. Many prominent social leaders were invited to the campus as guest lecturers. Mrs. Rand endowed a "Rand lectureship" which each year brought some well-known social prophet to Grinnell. Other notables came to speak at Gates' or Herron's invitation. The YMCA lectureships, though not directly related to the new department, reflected the new emphases. Among those who lectured at Grinnell in the years of the Kingdom movement (1893-96) were John P. Coyle, noted Massachusetts pastor; Benjamin Fay Mills, one of the nation's leading evangelists; Graham Taylor, Professor of Christian Sociology at the Chicago Theological Seminary and founder of Chicago Commons; Edward W. Bemis, progressive social thinker; Hamlin Garland, literary spokesman for the discontented sons of the middle border; Thomas C. Hall, pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Chicago; Henry D. Lloyd, author of the famous exposé of the methods of the Standard Oil Company, *Wealth Against Commonwealth*; Charles M. Sheldon, prominent Topeka clergyman who was soon to write *In His Steps*; William T. Stead, author of the startling survey of Chicago's social conditions, *If Christ Came to Chicago!*; Ellen G. Starr, a leader at Jane Addams' Hull House; and Robert A. Woods, head resident at Andover (later South End) House, a social settlement in Boston. Under Gates' and Herron's leadership, the Iowa College campus became the center of the Kingdom movement. Here social leaders found a platform for their messages. Here young men and women were trained to think in new patterns and a group of loyal workers was gathered.

²² "The Chair of Applied Christianity at Iowa College," *The Congregationalist*, LXXIX (January-June, 1894), 557.

But the Kingdom movement was not limited to Grinnell; it spread rapidly and found sympathizers across the land. Herron rose rapidly to a position of national prominence. Dr. Nollen said, "The impact of the personality and teachings of Professor Herron upon the college and the larger community was electric; it soon became nation wide."²³ His books received considerable attention; for example, a reviewer summarized his early publications as follows:

Dr. Herron's writings are characterized by vigor of thought, intense enthusiasm, incisive, flashing utterance and an unfailing faith that the central doctrines of Christianity offer the true solution for all the problems, personal, social and political, that vex our times. His attitude is that of the prophet rather than the student.²⁴

But probably more significant in his rise to national conspicuousness than his writings were his lecture tours as the leading voice of the Kingdom movement. He was of arresting appearance: slender, medium in height, dark, bearded, brown-eyed. He had unusual platform abilities, though he spoke in a solemn, slow, impressive manner and used rather awkward gestures. His deep sincerity and perfect self-assurance gave him a tremendous hold over his audiences, upon which he exerted almost hypnotic power. Even to attempt to list the places at which he spoke on his long tours would be an onerous task, for while on tours he often spoke two or three times a day.²⁵ For example, early in 1894 he took a long tour, speaking at such places as the University of Michigan, Indiana State University, Lawrence College, Union Theological Seminary, Princeton University, and the Congregational Club of Brooklyn.²⁶ On his tours, hundreds of people often crowded in to hear him, and the newspapers reported his words and actions in detail. He provoked much controversy and discussion whenever he spoke. For example, after a lecture series in Montreal the Rev. J. B. Silcox reported:

23 "Educational Pioneer," 94.

24 *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, VIII (1893), 111.

25 The columns of the college papers, *Scarlet and Black* and *The Unit*, and those of the town paper, *The Grinnell Herald*, abound with references to Herron's extensive lecture activity in these years.

26 The lectures given on this tour were published as Herron's fifth book, *The Christian Society*.

If a dynamite bomb had exploded in a public square of the city, it would not have aroused public attention any more than did the course of sermons and lectures on Christian Sociology, recently delivered by Dr. Herron. It is strange that a gentle, quiet, loving man should so shake and agitate the conservative old city under the shadow of Mount Royal.²⁷

A dramatic address by Herron at the University of Nebraska in June, 1894, made front page news across the country when it was bitterly attacked by Governor Crounse of Nebraska who labelled Herron an anarchist.²⁸ This lecture, "The Christian State, or a New Political Vision," Herron later expanded into a lecture series and finally published as his sixth book.²⁹ The most dramatic episode of Herron's lecturing experiences occurred when he undertook a six-week trip to the West coast. On this tour, during which he spoke many times in both northern and southern California, he became the center of a controversy that became the focus of national attention. He was bitterly attacked by a group of opposers headed by the Rev. C. O. Brown, then pastor of the First Congregational Church of San Francisco.³⁰ Herron's defenders hastened to defend him in several widely-read symposia.³¹ Later in that year, Herron lectured at the Waseca Summer Assembly, at the Summer School of Social Economics at Chicago Commons,³² and at many other places. As the leading voice of the Kingdom move-

27 "Dr. Herron at Montreal," *The Kingdom*, VII (1894-95), 44.

28 George Howard Gibson, "Dr. Herron at Lincoln," *Ibid.*, 171 f.; see also Dombrowski, *Early Days*, 178.

29 *The Christian State: A Political Vision of Christ. A Course of Lectures Delivered in Various American Cities* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1895). In this book, the note of both theological and social radicalism that had been evident in his work from the start became more pronounced; these trends made him increasingly the center of sharp controversy. He said, for example, "It will doubtless be expedient that present forms of institutions progressively pass away, in order that the government of the world by the immediate inspiration of God may increase and be fulfilled" (121).

30 C. O. Brown, *Professor Herron's Teachings Reviewed: Ought the Church of Christ to Join the Propaganda of Socialism? An Address to the First Congregational Church, San Francisco, Sunday Evening, April 21, 1895* (San Francisco, [1895]).

31 J. K. McLean, et al., "Professor Herron in California," *The Kingdom*, VIII (1895-96), 115-19; Adeline Knapp, et al., "Prof. George D. Herron: The Man and His Work in California," *The Arena*, XIV (1895), 110-28. The latter was republished as a pamphlet, *Prof. George D. Herron: The Man and His Work on the Pacific Coast* (Boston: The Arena Publishing Co., [1895]).

32 These lectures he revised and repeated, and published as his seventh book, *Social Meanings of Religious Experiences* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1896).

ment, Herron was spreading its doctrines wherever he went; through him it achieved its greatest outreach and influence.

The interests of the Kingdom movement were also furthered on the national scene through a weekly journal. *The Northwestern Congregationalist*, a small denominational paper published in Minneapolis under the editorship of Herbert W. Gleason, had published articles favorable to a social interpretation of Christianity. In the issue of January 5, 1894, Gates had conducted a symposium on the subject, "The Church and the Kingdom of God." The symposium attracted much attention, and led to a meeting at Grinnell of a group of leaders who resolved to make *The Northwestern Congregationalist* an instrument of the new movement. Accordingly, the name was changed to *The Kingdom* and the first issue appeared April 20, 1894.³³ Gleason continued as managing editor, advised by a board of associate editors who served without pay. Among those who served as the original associate editors were John P. Coyle, Thomas C. Hall, B. Fay Mills, John R. Commons, progressive economist and sociologist, Jesse Macy, professor of political economy at Iowa, and George D. Black and Luther L. West, prominent Congregational clergymen. Josiah Strong, general secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, was on the original board but soon resigned as the executive board of his organization wished to cut all connection with Herron's increasing radicalism.³⁴ At various times others joined this editorial group, notably John Bascom, leading sociologist and educator; Charles Zeublin, professor at the University of Chicago; Washington Gladden, prominent Congregational minister and social gospel leader; and Robert A. Woods. This weekly, which lasted for five years, became ". . . the most widely circulated social-gospel paper published prior to the World War."³⁵ Gates and Herron were the leading figures in this journalistic enterprise. Gleason later said, "As a matter of fact, Pres. Gates has been, from the beginning, the editor-in-chief of *The Kingdom*."³⁶ But he gave Herron great credit, too, adding, "Indeed, it would be hard to say to which of these two friends

33 The story of the founding of *The Kingdom* and an account of its policies can be found in Dombrowski, *Early Days*, 110-20.

34 May, *Protestant Churches*, 255.

35 Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 165.

36 *The Kingdom*, XI (1898-99), 499.

The Kingdom is the more greatly indebted."³⁷ This journal, in the first several years of its life, was the organ of the Kingdom movement; it carried its messages, announced its activities, defended its leaders, and fought its battles.

An organization that proved useful in helping to accomplish the aims of the movement was the American Institute of Christian Sociology, which was founded at Chautauqua, New York, in 1893 by such Christian social leaders as Richard T. Ely, Washington Gladden, John R. Commons, and George D. Herron, aided by Bishop John H. Vincent, the founder of the Chautauqua movement.³⁸ It was intended by the founders that the Institute should parallel the work of the (Episcopal) Christian Social Union but for members of other denominations. The "Objects" of the Institute were patterned after those of the Union. They were:

1. To claim for the Christian law the ultimate authority to rule social practice.
2. To study in common how to apply the principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time.
3. To present Christ as the Living Master and King of men and His Kingdom as the complete ideal of human society, to be realized on earth.³⁹

Ely served as first president of the Institute, Commons was secretary while Herron served as its "organizer" and "principal of instruction." He so magnified his office that he made the Institute an instrument of the Kingdom movement. He became the third president, following Josiah Strong. The Institute was intended to win the church to a realization of its social responsibilities. Its method was to issue publications and leaflets, to sponsor lectures and addresses, to establish libraries and professorships, to organize summer assemblies, and to encourage the formation of local institutes of Christian Sociology. Leading local institutes were set up at Belleville, Illinois, Clifton Springs, New York, Waseca, Minnesota, and Oberlin, Ohio. Thus chiefly through the activity of Herron, the American

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ John R. Commons, "American Institute of Christian Sociology," *The Congregationalist*, LXXVIII (July-December, 1893), 32; Irving Meredith, "American Institute of Christian Sociology," *ibid.*, 134 f.; "American Institute of Christian Sociology," *Encyclopedia of Social Reform*, ed. W. D. P. Bliss (1897). Cf. also Abell, *Urban Impact*, 110 f., and Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, 164 f.

³⁹ *The Kingdom*, VII (1894-95), 9.

Institute of Christian Sociology became an important organizational aspect of the Kingdom movement.

Among the most important achievements of the Kingdom movement were the "Schools of the Kingdom" which met for eight days after the close of the academic year on the Iowa College campus in 1894 and 1895.⁴⁰ In 1894, the school was sponsored jointly by the Department of Applied Christianity and the American Institute of Christian Sociology and was attended by about four hundred ministers and laymen from fourteen states and Canada. Chiefly the Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Episcopal denominations were represented. In 1895 the attendance was somewhat smaller, but at both schools speakers of great prominence were present. Among the leaders were such figures as George A. Gates, George D. Herron, John P. Coyle, Thomas C. Hall, John R. Commons, Jesse Macy, Graham Taylor, B. Fay Mills, Robert A. Woods, William Howe Tolman, later to be the founder of the American Institute for Social Service, Leighton Williams, prominent figure in the Brotherhood of the Kingdom, and Charles James Wood, an Episcopalian of the Maurician tradition. The Schools were intended for earnest and interested people who wished to study about the kingdom of God and discover ways and forces for its realization on earth. A tone of high seriousness and intense moral eagerness was generated at these meetings. Many of those who attended went back to their places of service to spread further the fame of the prophet of Grinnell and to work toward the goals envisioned by the Kingdom movement. In many respects the Kingdom movement exerted the large influence that it did because of the success of the Schools of the Kingdom. Local schools patterned after the one at Grinnell were set up in various places.⁴¹

The Kingdom movement was at its peak of influence in 1894 and 1895; in those years of social unrest it made con-

40 "A School of the Kingdom," *The Kingdom*, VII (1894-95), 9; "A School of the Kingdom," *ibid.*, VIII (1895-96), 22; "The Retreat and Summer School at Iowa College," *The Congregationalist*, LXXIX (July-December, 1894), 58 f.; Hery Smith McCowan, "The School of the Kingdom," *Our Day*, XV (1895), 62-70.

41 E. g., in November, 1894, a week-long "School of the Kingdom" was held in Detroit; Edward W. Bemis, John R. Commons, Thomas C. Hall, Jane Addams, and George D. Herron were the chief speakers (*The Kingdom*, VII [1894-95], 471).

siderable impression on the churches. The movement operated, as has been observed, through many agencies: the Department of Applied Christianity at Iowa College; the vigorous platform activities of the prophet; the pages of *The Kingdom*, the American Institute of Christian Sociology; and the retreats and Schools of the Kingdom. Central in all these activities was the conspicuous figure of George D. Herron. In no small measure, the later success of the social gospel in many Protestant denominations was because of the preparatory educative work accomplished by the Kingdom movement.⁴²

This very centrality of Herron in the movement led to its decline and disappearance. Herron's increasing radicalism, both social and theological, won for him many powerful enemies and lost for him the support of many moderate progressives. Careful study of Herron's career makes it clear that he was rejected as not being a safe and trustworthy leader by the churches in general as early as 1896; after that time his influence was exerted largely on certain restricted radical social Christian circles and on certain reform and radical elements beyond the churches. For by 1896 Herron's critics had shaken the confidence of the churches in him. Many accused him of being anti-church.⁴³ Others thought his theology was unscriptural, pantheistic, vague, and merely humanitarian.⁴⁴

⁴² May has divided the Christian social movement into three broad groupings: conservative social Christianity, the moderately progressive social gospel, and radical social Christianity (*Protestant Churches*, 163-265). The Kingdom movement and *The Kingdom* were definitely "social gospel"; though Herron had radical elements in his thinking that finally led him to a full radical social Christian position, in this period he won the co-operation of the social gospellers, though with increasing difficulty. The very term "social gospel" was first popularized by the Kingdom movement. Hopkins has indicated that it was the Georgia Christian Commonwealth that coined and spread the term "social gospel" which had been used only incidentally before this time (*Rise of the Social Gospel*, 196 f.). But the term was used by supporters of the Kingdom movement. For example, Truman O. Douglass, Jr., one of Herron's students, used the term in correspondence (*The Kingdom*, VII [1894-95], 109. H. Paul Douglass also used the expression ("The Kingdom of God—A Résumé of the Teachings of Professor George D. Herron, D.D.," *Our Day*, XIV [1895], 274). Gates also used the term ("The Social Gospel in Japan," *The Kingdom* X [1897-98], 700 f.) though this was just after the Georgia community had commenced its publication, *The Social Gospel*. Ralph Albertson, a leader in the Georgia experiment and an editor of its journal, had been in touch with the Kingdom movement; Herron lectured at his church in Springfield, Ohio, in 1894. Perhaps he got the term from the Kingdom movement originally.

⁴³ E. g., cf. Z. Swift Holbrook, "The Anti-Church Crusade," *The Congregationalist*, LXXIX (January-June, 1894), 266.

⁴⁴ E. g., cf. Frank Hugh Foster, "Prof. George D. Herron as a Leader," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, V (1894), 562.

Still others attacked Herron because they valued the capitalistic and competitive order and felt that his teachings would undermine it.⁴⁵ But probably the most common form of attack on Herron was to charge him with being impractical and unconstructive. A reviewer of *The Christian Society* said what many others were saying:

But the chief criticism which most readers probably will make upon the book is that, able and telling although it is, it is not sufficiently constructive . . . It does not wholly omit positive suggestions, but it offers too little in this direction. It criticizes and condemns, points out freely what is amiss, and aims to stimulate a noble discontent with the unjust and unrighteous conditions, and this is well. But it ought, in our judgment, to offer more in the way of help toward the practical remedy of existing evil.⁴⁶

The storm of criticism upon Herron began to come even from those who were active in the Christian social movement. W. D. P. Bliss, indefatigable Christian social leader, became increasingly critical of Herron's movement and message. He said:

We only regret that tone that the movement is taking against institutional Christianity. Dr. Herron has a noble scorn of schemes and plans and arrangements. He scores the instituted church with eloquent yet with vehement words. He by no means would destroy, though he would radically revolutionize, the church. For institutions of any kind, he seems to have small respect. He is almost a Tolstoi, Christian Individualist, rather than a Christian Socialist. . . .

The main criticism in the West upon Dr. Herron's writings comes from hard-headed businessmen, who say they are impractical. This is correct. We know of nothing more impractical than to teach Christ's Sociology, and leave out the social basis of that teaching. For thousands of years God taught the law of Sinai, for which Dr. Herron has small use, desiring to fly to the top while destroying the foundation. This is the inherent difficulty with all Christian Individualism, and we fear will prove the weakness of the American Institute of Christian Sociology. Yet we sincerely welcome this movement, because Dr. Herron's vision, on other points, is so clear, and his spirit so completely true, that we believe he will modify his present position on this point, and use his, at present, almost unequalled spiritual and chaste eloquence, for the teaching of the true sociology of both Old and New Testaments.⁴⁷

The influential Washington Gladden, perhaps the outstanding social gospel leader before Rauschenbusch, said:

45 E. g., cf. Breed, "Christian Beneficence," and Brown, *Herron's Teachings*.

46 *The Congregationalist*, LXXIX (January-June, 1894), 791.

47 *The Dawn*, VI (1894), 82 f.

I have been reading some of Dr. Herron's books and trying to understand the message which he is delivering with so much sincerity and conviction. With what I conceive to be the purpose of this teaching I am in the heartiest accord, I believe as thoroughly as he does that Christ's law is the law of society, though I should differ with him in the interpretation of that law. I believe with him that the distinction which men have been making between things sacred and things secular is misleading and pernicious; that every part of life is to be Christianized. I believe as he does that the kingdom of God is greater than the church and that the superior allegiance of every disciple of Christ is to the kingdom and not to the church.

These truths, which he so strongly emphasizes, are vital truths, and I thank God for the courage and earnestness with which he is proclaiming them . . . But in many other places he declares that the kingdom of God can only come through the destruction of religious institutions . . . Such sweeping denunciations of institutions as essentially evil—as embodying the spirit of anti-Christ—are common, . . . The petulant denunciations of institutions with which Dr. Herron's pages bristle indicate some lack of careful reflection. The family is an institution, shall we abolish it? The state is an institution, is anarchy better than organized government?⁴⁸

The end result of this mounting tide of criticism was that by 1896 Herron was rejected by the churches as not being a safe leader and was generally regarded with suspicion. The church periodicals clearly reflected this situation. A review of *The Christian State* in one of the leading religious periodicals of the day said:

We must, however, set to the author's credit a great store of sociological idealism of a high and inspiring type, a fine conception of the constructive and organic genius of Christianity in social and political relations and a generous love of justice which, in a writer of such rhetorical power and earnest temper, might be turned to good account were it not combined with an incurable passion for getting up little judgment days and pronouncing universal doom with only a very small fraction of the universe in evidence before him. It is a pity that a writer so earnest and so sincere cannot be taken seriously. . . .

Professor Herron's alarm is great because his ignorance is colossal, and usually he seems to be under the impression that absolute ignorance of a subject leaves him at liberty to say what he will about it . . . A writer who mixes things up in this way can have no use in the great and rational work of reform.⁴⁹

The editors of the official Congregational weekly published a review of Herron's work that reflected the general opinion of Herron that had come to prevail in church circles. They said:

48 "Shall We Abolish Institutions?", *The Congregationalist*, LXXIX (January-June, 1894), 971.

49 *The Independent*, XLVII (1895), 913.

Certainly he is not yet a safe teacher in respect of some facts and principles of political economy. Certain of his utterances have been criticized as subversive of orderly society, and not without much reason, although of course he is innocent of any anarchistic purpose.

We shall be disappointed if increasing knowledge and experience do not lead him to correct his views in important respects, and thus perhaps to become a permanent leader of public thought who may be followed safely and who will do great and lasting good. But without many and great modifications of his present opinions he can only be an unsafe guide.⁵⁰

But it soon became apparent that whatever modifications there were in Herron's views were toward the left and not the right, and after 1896 he was not seriously considered in the churches, except by isolated individuals and in restricted circles.⁵¹ Naturally, this rejection of its leading figure harmed the Kingdom movement and the trends in his thought alienated some of his supporters.⁵² Then, early in 1896, Herron's health failed and he had to go abroad for over a year of total rest. The Kingdom movement, as such, swiftly declined and was not much heard of again. The Schools of the Kingdom were not held again, and though *The Kingdom* continued to 1899 the Kingdom movement was little referred to after 1896. When Herron resumed his work at Grinnell in the fall of 1897, he made no attempt to revive the Kingdom movement, but focused his activities about another movement entirely. By 1896, then, the Kingdom movement as a distinguishable movement faded, and its supporters and sympathizers undertook new activities and supported other movements.

The Kingdom movement, though short-lived, played a great part in the development of the Christian social movement in the crucial years of the 1890's. It influenced the churches in a lasting way, for in its big years it confronted them with a social

50 "Dr. Herron and His Work," *The Congregationalist*, LXXX (January-June, 1895), 990.

51 This judgment modifies the view that has been generally held, that Herron's influence in the churches continued undiminished until about 1901, when his divorce and remarriage undermined it (cf. Paul F. Laubenstein, "A History of Christian Socialism in America" [unpublished S.T.M. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, 1925], 86; May, *Protestant Churches*, 256).

52 E. g., John R. Commons later said that he found himself so out of sympathy with certain trends in Herron's message that he raised an issue which split the Institute of Christian Sociology and led to its disappearance (*Myself* [New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934], 51).

message and forced them to consider it. Professor Noble commented on its lasting effects as follows:

Wrecked as a specific movement, it left an influence which can never die. Teachings which we have had again and again, in the Gates Memorial Lectures are echoes of that old "School of the Kingdom," without the extremes which weakened those utterances.⁵³

Truman O. Douglass, historian of Iowa Congregationalism and consistent opponent of Herron and his movement even though his sons, Truman O. Douglass, Jr., and H. Paul Douglass studied under him, in later years could admit the lasting effects of the movement. He said:

The call of the Church from excessive "other worldliness" to the betterment of this present evil world, gave a new sacredness and glory to human life, and set men longing and looking anew for the "new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." It turned young men away from the ministry of the Church, but it filled them with a passion for social service and sent them out into the slums and charity work in endless variety. It criticized the Church unmercifully and unjustly and without discrimination; but the Church undoubtedly has profited somewhat by the castigation, . . . Certain it is that on the whole the Church is now as never before striving for the redemption of the whole of every man the world around, so that the movement even as we know it in Iowa, with all its excesses, extravagances, eccentricities and its sins, was one of the "all things" working together for good. Undoubtedly it must now be admitted that the main contentions of the general movement are now generally accepted. For the most part the utterances of "The Kingdom" would be mere commonplaces today, as indeed many of them were then.⁵⁴

Dr. Nollen noted that Herron had made a powerful impression on serious minds across the land, and stated that the Grinnell movement was one of the factors in the rise of the social gospel and the progressive movement. He said:

The administration of President Gates had made Grinnell a pioneer in the preaching of the social gospel. Reform was in the air, and soon the muckraker was abroad, proclaiming the economic and social sins of the nation.⁵⁵

That the social gospel could arise to official acceptance in many Protestant churches in the twentieth century was in great measure because of the groundwork done by the Kingdom movement. As Herron's successor at Iowa College said:

⁵³ "Twenty-five Years," 10.

⁵⁴ *The Pilgrims of Iowa* (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1911), 264.

⁵⁵ "Educational Pioneer," 98.

The radicalism of my predecessor had by the time I began my work become more or less the accepted doctrine of the churches. At least no one was startled by the word social as related to the teachings of Jesus. The seed sown by the pioneers had germinated well, and many churches were permeated by the social spirit of the gospel.⁵⁶

The strengths and limitations of the social gospel that became so important in the twentieth century were in certain respects similar to the strengths and weaknesses of the Kingdom movement that had done so much to prepare the way for it. On the one hand, both movements were marked by a sincere concern for human problems, an awareness of the importance of social issues, a devotion to intellectual honesty, and a loyalty to Jesus Christ; on the other hand they were characterized by an overly sentimental view of man and the universe, a lack of realistic political and social strategy, and a too-ready acceptance of certain nineteenth-century ideas at the expense of some of the historic insights of the Christian faith. But the history of the important Christian social movement as a whole can be greatly illuminated by detailed study of certain periods and aspects of the movement; for example, a study of the Kingdom movement makes much clearer the course of the American Christian social movement and demonstrates the importance of the middle nineties in the movement's history.

56 Edward A. Steiner, cited by Isabel Smith Gates, *Life of George Augustus Gates*, 17.

ZWINGLI STUDY SINCE 1918

BARD THOMPSON

Union Theological Seminary, New York

This bibliographical review of works on Ulrich Zwingli is partial evidence of a quarter-century of considerable scholarly activity directed toward the history of the continental Reformed churches.* At first glance, the memorial volumes commemorating the 400th anniversary of the Zurich Reformation (1519-1919) and of the Reformer's death at Kappel (1531-1931) would seem to account for the inordinate number of Zwingli studies since 1918; but an equal volume of scholarship devoted, without such promptings, to Martin Bucer, or the Weber Thesis, or the Reformation in the Netherlands confirms the trend toward interested historical inquiry, stimulated perhaps by the return to the mainstream of Reformation thought. Zwingli scholars, writing since the close of World War I, seem to share this interest. Research has been brought to bear chiefly on the Reformer's "development," whether biblical or humanistic, and on his sacramental doctrine. The latter, especially, touches upon some of the most important influences and tensions arising from the Reformation and has been carried as far afield as the present concern over the "shape" of the Book of Common Prayer. The Swiss historians, although not of one mind, have led the way in championing and perhaps protecting Zwingli. Their best service has been to reset the foundations for scholarship. By clarifying and defining more rigidly the term "Zwinglian," they have reduced its stigma and restored its historical meaning.

In the following pages, an attempt has been made to select, classify, and summarize the most significant contributions to this cumulative study of Zwingli. Several drastic and painful reductions of material have left only the most important or, vari-

* Professor John T. McNeill intended to supplement his bibliographical review of "Thirty Years of Calvin Study," *Church History*, XVII (1948), 207-40, by a similar treatment of the historical literature concerning the Reformed churches of Europe to the opening of the Thirty Years' War. As the work progressed, it became increasingly evident that the amount of material was too vast to be included in a single article. It was necessary, therefore, to divide the material, this being one of several similar studies in preparation. Professor McNeill started me on the way with some notes and has since given me guidance.

ously, the most recent of duplicating writings, in addition to the controversial theses. Each title has been numbered to facilitate reference.

I. Bibliography and Memorial Volumes

Bibliographical guides for Zwingli study are numerous and generally helpful. Of first importance are the supplements, "Bibliographie der Schweizergeschichte," to the periodical, *Anzeiger für schweizerische Geschichte*, XII-XVIII (1913-1919), and its successor, *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Geschichte*, I-XX (1920-1940).¹ Comments on the older literature are found in Gustav Wolf's *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte*, II, 1 (Gotha, 1922), "Zwingli," 296-337.² Wolf's collection is slightly supplemented by Ernst Stähelin's "Die Zwingliliteratur der Jahre 1913-1920," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*,** XXXIX (1922), 166-76.³ Scholarship to 1930 is included in H. Meltzer's "Zwingli-Literatur," *Zeitschrift für den evangelischen Religionsunterricht*, XLII (1931), 299-304.⁴ A valuable, if specialized, bibliography has been assembled by Leo Weiss: "Die neuere Zwingli-literatur in Ungarn," *Zwingliana*, VI (1934-37), 282-85.⁵ There are useful, selected bibliographies appended to Zwingli studies in the standard encyclopaedias: Hugh Watt, "Zwingli," *Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, XII (New York, 1921), 873-76;⁶ Hubert Jedin, "Zwingli," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, X (Freiburg, 1938), 1114-18;⁷ and Walther Köhler (sometimes, as in this case, "Koehler"), "Zwingli," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, V (Tübingen, 1931), 2152-58.⁸ One will also want to consult Walther Köhler's extensive article, "Die neuere Zwingli-Forschung," *Theologische Rundschau*, NF, IV (1932), 329-69,⁹ and, certainly, the list of the writings by that industrious Zwingli scholar included in his own *Festgabe* (Zurich, 1940),¹⁰ prepared as a supplement to *Zwingliana* (1940) by the Zwingli-Verein. In Volume II of his *Bibliographie* (Leipzig, 1935), 414-35, Karl Schottenloher lists over 450 titles for Zwingli—a number which precludes any apology for the highly selective policy which will be followed here. Only those writings which treat Zwingli *per se* will be included. Rudolf Hauri's historiograph-

** Hereafter the reader will be referred to this periodical by the abbreviation *ZFK*.

ical work is therefore of special value for a catalogue and discussion of works which consider Zwingli in terms of general and Swiss Church History and the history of political thought: *Die Reformation in der Schweiz im Urteil der neueren schweizerischen Geschichtschreibung: Schweizer Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft*, NF, VII (Zurich, 1945).¹¹

The 400th anniversary of the Zurich Reformation (1519-1919) was celebrated by the publication of a memorial volume, *Ulrich Zwingli, 1519-1919, Zum Gedächtnis der Zürcher Reformation* (Zurich, 1919),¹² containing studies of Zwingli as Statesman, Theologian and Reformer by Walther Köhler, Oskar Farner, Wilhelm Oechsli and others. The anniversary of Zwingli's death was commemorated by a special number of *Zwingliana* (Vol. V, 1931, pp. 227-317)—"Huldrych Zwingli zum Gedächtnis seines Todes am 11. Oktober 1531"¹³—containing contributions by Farner, Köhler, Fritz Blanke, Leonhard von Muralt, and Hermann Escher. For the same occasion, Peter Barth contributed "Zwingli: Zum 400-jährigen Gedächtnis seines Todestages," *Zeitwende*, VII (1931), 344-56.¹⁴ Johann Conrad Gasser's "*Denkschrift, Vierhundert Jahre Zwingli-Bibel 1524-1924*" (Zurich, 1924)¹⁵ is a commemorative study of the publication of the Zwingli Bible and its permanence through 400 years. The anniversary book by the Theological Faculty of Basel University, *Aus fünf Jahrhunderten schweizerischer Kirchengeschichte* (Basel, 1932),¹⁶ is also rich in Zwingli materials.

II. Zwingli's Writings

Five volumes have been added to *Huldreich Zwingli's Sämtliche Werke* (Leipzig), edited for the Zwingli-Verein by Emil Egli, Georg Finsler, *et al.* Volume IV, *Corpus Reformatorum XCI* (1927), contains writings of 1525-27;¹⁷ volume V, *CR, XCII* (1934), includes letters of 1526-27;¹⁸ volumes IX, X, XI, *CR, XCVI, XCVII, XCVIII* (1925, 1929, 1935),¹⁹ comprise Zwingli's correspondence from 1527 to October, 1531. Samuel Macauley Jackson's task of editing, in English translation, the *Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli* has been taken up by William J. Hinke, who has produced volume II, *Selected Works 1526-1531* (Philadelphia, 1922),²⁰ and by Clarence N. Heller who has edited volume III, *Various Works* (Philadelphia, 1929).²¹ Two or three more volumes

were included in the project as originally conceived. An important series, *Zwingli Hauptschriften* (Zurich), is now being produced by the Zwingli-Verlag and under the editorship of Fritz Blanke, Oskar Farner, and Rudolf Pfister. The first two volumes, by Farner, *Zwingli der Prediger* (1940-41),²² include for the first time all the extant sermons, printed in the original text, with notes. Henri Strohl has written an appreciative review: "Zwingli Predicateur," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, XXV (1945), 41-51.²³ Volume III, edited by Oskar Frei, is the first of two parts on *Zwingli, der Verteidiger des Glaubens* (1947),²⁴ and contains Articles 1-22 of the *Schlussreden*. *Zwingli als Staatsmann* (1942)²⁵ is the title of the seventh volume (complete in itself), prepared by Rudolf Pfister. Five political works are included. Part I of *Zwingli der Theologe*²⁶ appeared as volume IX in 1941. It consists entirely of the *Kommentar über die wahre und falsche Religion*, edited by Fritz Blanke. Volume XII (1948),²⁷ by Pfister, is the third part of *Zwingli der Theologe* and includes *Von der Taufe, Über das Abendmahl* and other works. Presumably volume X will, as Part II, complete the trilogy on Zwingli's theology.

Some smaller collections and a number of individual works have appeared since 1918. A history of Zwingli-editions and Mykonius' biography of the Reformer are included in *Eine Auswahl aus seinen Schriften auf das vierhundertjährige Jubiläum der Zürcher Reformation* (Zurich, 1918),²⁸ produced by Finsler, Köhler, and Arnold Rüegg. Oskar Farner has prepared *Huldrych Zwinglis Briefe* (Zurich, 1918),²⁹ a collection of 140 of a possible 1,200 letters, translated into High German. Farner has also edited "Zwingli's words for our time," a collection of pertinent sayings in their original form, under the title, *Gott ist Meister* (Zurich, 1944).³⁰ Walther Köhler has compounded a history of the Swiss Reformation by using selected passages of Zwingli's writings: *Das Buch der Reformation Huldrych Zwinglis von ihm selbst und gleichzeitigen Quellen erzählt* (Munich, 1926).³¹ Volumes IV-VI of *Zwingliana* are rich in minor writings, many recently uncovered. The relevant pages are noted in Schottenloher II, 414-35 and V, 288-91.

Interpretations of Zwingli's works are quite as numerous.

An admirable summary is contained in the second volume—*Zwingli*—of Paul Wernle's *Der evangelische Glaube nach den Hauptschriften der Reformatoren* (Tübingen, 1919).³² Oskar Farner has studied "Zwingli's Entwicklung zum Reformator nach seinem Briefwechsel bis Ende 1522," *Zwingliana* III (1913-20), 1-17, 33-45, 65-87, 97-115, 129-41, 161-80.³³ In "Ulrich Zwingli d'après ses oeuvres," *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, 1931, 205-32,³⁴ André Bouvier follows a similar procedure, giving French translations of certain extracts of Zwingli's works.

III. Life and Work of Zwingli

Oskar Farner's two-volume biography offers perhaps the best introduction to Zwingli's early life and development. Volume I, *Huldrych Zwingli: Seine Jugend, Schulzeit und Studentenjahre 1484-1506* (Zurich, 1945),³⁵ is a laborious work in which every scant scrap of information is reconstructed into something of a biography, thus overcoming the literary reticence of the early "self-conscious" Zwingli. Farner has also studied these early years in a monograph, *Aus Zwingli's Kindheit* (Zurich, 1944).³⁶ Volume II of the biography, *Huldrych Zwingli, Seine Entwicklung zum Reformator 1506-1520* (Zurich, 1946),³⁷ views the "conversion" of Zwingli in 1516 and his break with Rome in 1520 in the light of the four formative periods of his development: (1) Catholic and patriot, (2) the student of Humanism, (3) the Patristic scholar and Erasmusian, (4) the preacher of Grossmünster and student of Augustine. Farner has made extensive use of Zwingli's correspondence. Paul Burckhardt's valuable, if popular, book, *Huldreich Zwingli: Eine Darstellung seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Lebenswerks* (Zurich, 1918),³⁸ is by design not a biography but a review of the lifelong development of the Reformer and serves, therefore, as a useful supplement to Oskar Farner's second volume. Farner himself has studied "H. Zwingli als Persönlichkeit," *Zwingliana*, V (1931), 229-242.³⁹

Numerous general biographies have appeared since 1918. H. Alexander Clay's "Huldreich Zwingli a Man 1484-1531," *Contemporary Review*, CXL (1931), 629-36,⁴⁰ is one of the few recent studies in English, and, at that, is brief and factually biographical. In a very recent work, *Zwingli* (Geneva, 1947),⁴¹ Jaques Courvoisier studies "L'homme" (1) and "Le Réfor-

mateur" (II) and includes chapters on the Reform in Zurich and Zwingli's efforts to consolidate the Swiss Reformation. A similar outline is used by Walther Köhler in *Ulrich Zwingli und die Reformation in der Schweiz* (Tübingen, 1919).⁴² This volume of 100 pages is perhaps the most extensive of a number of small, popular biographies by Köhler, among them *Huldreich Zwingli: Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben*, IX (Leipzig, 1923)⁴³ and *Huldrych Zwingli* (Leipzig, 1943).⁴⁴ Dieter Cunz's *Ulrich Zwingli* (Aarau, 1937)⁴⁵ is a short, popular book which benefits from the scholarship of Wernle, Köhler, Farner, *et al.* Henri Hug's *Ulrich Zwingli* (Lusanne, 1931)⁴⁶ offers a biographical treatment of considerable extent and scholarship. George W. Richards' chapter (V), "Zwingli and the Reformed Tradition" in *Protestantism* (Nashville, 1944),⁴⁷ a symposium edited by William K. Anderson, dwells upon Zwingli's humanism as an important basis for his distinctive characteristics.

Especially valuable are the numerous studies of the characteristics of Zwingli's personality and activity. Oskar Farner has written 23 packed pages on *Huldrych Zwingli und seine Sprache: Volks-Bücher des Deutschschweizerischen Sprachvereins*, Heft V (Basel, 1918),⁴⁸ finding his speech to be strong, direct and, as the Word of God bore on it, "triumphant, imposing, and penetrating." In a laborious monograph, *Huldrych Zwinglis Bibliothek* (Zurich, 1921),⁴⁹ and in an extended article, "Aus Zwinglis Bibliothek," *ZFK*, XL (1922), 41-73; XLII (1923), 49-76; XLV (1926-27), 243-76,⁵⁰ Walther Köhler lists the important books used by Zwingli and explains how he acquired them. The latter work includes a discussion of the marginal notes written by Zwingli in his volume of Aristotle and Athanasius. In this connection, one will also want to consult Köhler's article, "Die Randglossen Zwinglis zum Römerbrief," *Forschung zur Kirchengeschichte und zur christlichen Kunst* (Leipzig, 1931), 87-106.⁵¹

Other detailed studies have been made. Walter Gut has presented "Zwingli als Erzieher," *Zwingliana*, VI (1934-37), 289-306; 242ff.⁵² That Zwingli was a student in Paris has been questioned by Köhler in two articles, "Zwingli Student in Paris?" *Zwingliana*, III (1920), 414-17,⁵³ and "Zu Zwinglis Pariser Studienaufenthalt," *Zwingliana*, IV (1921-28), 46-51. Oskar Farner has characterized "Zwinglis häusliches Leben,"⁵⁴

Ulrich Zwingli 1519-1919 (item 12), 201-212; and A. Carrodi-Sulzer has estimated his financial circumstances: "Zwingli's Vermögensverhältnisse," *Zwingliana*, IV (1921-28), 174-88.⁵⁵ Hans Baur's *Zwingli's Gattin Anna Reinhard* (Zurich, 1918)⁵⁶ is one of several recent studies on Anna Zwingli.

Scholarship has made a rather full investigation of Zwingli's practical efforts to further the course of the Reformation. In *Die Badener Disputation 1526: Quellen und Abhandlungen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte*, III (Leipzig, 1926),⁵⁷ Leonhard von Muralt justifies Zwingli's absence from the meeting as being in the interest of the continuation and the freedom of the reformation. "Zwingli as a statesman was unquestionably a failure" according to John Horsch's analysis of "The Struggle between Zwingli and the Swiss Brethren in Zurich," *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, VIII (1933), 142-161;⁵⁸ his victory was won entirely by the highly questionable execution of Jacob Grebel, the father of Conrad and a Zurich councilman, who held that the discipline of the Church applied only to voluntary members. Relative also to Zwingli's conflict with the Anabaptists is Carl Hemmann's review, "Zwingli's Stellung zur Tauffrage im literarischen Kampf mit den Anabaptisten," *Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift*, XXXVI (1919), 29-33; 79-85.⁵⁹ The catholic opposition to Zwingli in Zurich, 1519-1531, is discussed in Part I of Theodor Pestalozzi's *Die Gegner Zwingli's am Grossmünsterstift in Zürich* (Zurich, 1918).⁶⁰ Zwingli's relations with Bern have been examined quite thoroughly in Walther Köhler's monograph, *Zwingli und Bern: Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge*, Nr. 132 (Tübingen, 1928),⁶¹ which features the work of Berchtold Haller in transmitting the Reformer's influence. Köhler's "Zwingli und Italien,"⁶² *Aus fünf Jahrhunderten schweizerischer Kirchengeschichte* (item 16) is based largely on correspondence. Two other brief studies are of value: Köhler's "Zwingli und Basel," *Zwingliana*, V (1929-33), 2-10,⁶³ and Jacob Wipf's "Zwingli's Beziehungen zu Schaffhausen," *Zwingliana*, V (1929-33), 11-41.⁶⁴

An explanation and exposure of legends about Zwingli's heart and death are included in Ferdinand Vetter's "Schweizerische Reformationslegenden," *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Geschichte*, III (1922), 1-105.⁶⁵ The political and religious fac-

tors related to the Reformer's death at Kappel have been considered by Köhler (item 42), chapter V, and by Courvoisier (item 41), chapter V. Theodor Muller Wolfer's *Le siècle du schisme religieux* (Bern, 1925), 5-54,⁶⁶ will be helpful for military details. Other titles are listed in Schottenloher, IV, 325.

A number of "Zwinglibilder" have been collected and described by Kurt Guggisberg. His monographs, *Das Zwinglibild des Protestantismus in Wandel der Zeiten: Quellen und Abhandlungen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte*, VII (Leipzig, 1934)⁶⁷ and *Das Zwinglibild des Protestantismus von der Reformationszeit bis zur Aufklärung* (Bern, 1934)⁶⁸ study the treatment of Zwingli from his contemporaries to ours, including the representations of him in fiction, poetry, and drama. In an interesting monograph, *Das Zwinglibild Luthers: Sammlung Gemeinverständlicher Vorträge*, Nr. 131 (Tübingen, 1931),⁶⁹ Oskar Farner has studied Luther's disparaging remarks about Zwingli, ranging from expressions of distrust over Zwingli's sacramental doctrine to simple annoyance over his "Schwyzerdütsch." It is reported that, in a brighter moment, Luther said that Zwingli was "a fine, gay, sincere man"; more characteristic of Luther's feeling, however, was his observation that "Zwingli died like a murderer because he tried to persuade others to superstition." Jacob Berchtold-Belart has applied textual criticism in his extensive investigation of *Das Zwinglibild und die Zürcherischen Reformations-Chroniken: Quellen und Abhandlungen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte*, VIII (Leipzig, 1929).⁷⁰ Oskar Frei has compiled a "Bibliographie der poetischen Zwingli-Literatur," *Zwingliana*, VI (1934-37), 121-26.⁷¹ Modern representations include Emanuel Stickelberger's novel, *Zwingli* (Stuttgart, 1931),⁷² Wilhelm Schäfer's epic, *Huldreich Zwingli* (Weimar, 1927),⁷³ Oskar Farner's *Die Chronik von Huldrych Zwinglis Sterben* (Zurich, 1931)⁷⁴ and Johannes Ficher's "Zwingli Bildnis," *Zwingliana*, III (1913-20), 418-35.⁷⁵

IV. Doctrinal Studies

Walther Köhler's *Die Geistwelt Ulrich Zwinglis* (Gotha, 1920)⁷⁶ is a systematic presentation of Zwingli's thought without the handicap of a dogmatic scheme. "Christianity and Antiquity," according to Köhler, were the basic principles of the Reformer's "spiritual world." This emphasis is expressed also in

Köhler's "Zwingli als Theologe."⁷⁷ Ulrich Zwingli 1519-1919 (item 12) and has recently been given forthright expression in George W. Richards' statement, "Zwingli and the Reformed Tradition" (item 47), and in chapter III, "Huldreich Zwingli," of Arthur C. McGiffert's *Protestant Thought before Kant* (New York, 1931).⁷⁸ According to Köhler, Zwingli rejected, however, the humanistic cosmopolitan spirit: "He was and wanted to be nothing but a Swiss citizen . . . der Toggenburger." McGiffert concurs but adds, as a second peculiarity, Zwingli's interest in the common man. Believing that Zwingli's humanism has been overemphasized, a group of Swiss scholars have represented Zwingli as a Biblical Reformer. This trend is evident in Oskar Farner's biography (items 35, 37) and in Leonhard von Muralt's "Zwingli's dogmatisches Sondergut," *Zwingliana*, V (1929-33), 321-39; 353-68.⁷⁹ Arthur Rich's *Die Anfänge der Theologie Huldrych Zwingli's: Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des schweizerischen Protestantismus*, VI (Zurich, 1949)⁸⁰ and Otto Ritschl's *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, III (Göttingen, 1926), xlii-xlv shed light on this problem.⁸¹

Rudolf Pfister has concluded that the difference between Luther and Zwingli on the question of original sin is one of emphasis, not of principle, Luther's emphasis being upon the "amor sui," Zwingli's rather upon man's inability to fulfill the will of God: *Das Problem der Erbsünde bei Zwingli: Quellen und Abhandlungen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte*, IX (Leipzig, 1939).⁸² Abel E. Burckhardt shows Zwingli's doctrine of the divine Spirit in relation to classical and Christian authors whose works he read, in *Das Geistproblem bei Huldrych Zwingli: Quellen und Abhandlungen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte*, VI (Leipzig, 1932).⁸³ John T. McNeill, in *Unitive Protestantism* (New York, 1930), chapter II⁸⁴ and Paul Wernle, in *Zwingli: Der evangelische Glaube*, II (item 32), use Zwingli's writings to reject the idea that he held solely to the doctrine of the invisible church. McNeill notes a connection between the local churches and the catholic church, which imparts into the latter the idea of visibility. Wernle shows that Zwingli's emphasis lay in the church as part, closely associated with the state, of the theocratic society.

Zwingli as Biblical commentator and exegete has been carefully studied by Louis I. Newman, in an effort to confirm the

allegations made by Zwingli's contemporaries that his inclination toward the Old Testament, his study of the Hebrew language and literature, his opposition to images, and his advocacy of the theocratic principle were ultimately "Judaic": *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements* (New York, 1925), 454-510.⁸⁵ Zwingli's use of the Bible has been discussed in terms of inspiration, supremacy, sufficiency, and interpretation by C. Sydney Carter in *The Reformers and Holy Scripture* (London, 1928),⁸⁶ and in terms of authority by Rupert E. Davies in *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers* (London, 1946), chapter II.⁸⁷ According to Davies, Zwingli, following the emphases of Erasmus, held the Word of God (in the historical and concrete form of the canonical Scriptures) to be the sole and authoritative source of religious truth, which regulates the life of the Church and the life of the individual as lived in the Church, and which gives authorization to the state. For the early Zwingli, the state proceeded from this authorization to develop its own laws. Later, Zwingli placed the state directly under the régime of the Bible, the Bible being the law of political and economic life. Roger Ley, in *Kirchenzucht bei Zwingli: Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des schweizerischen Protestantismus*, II (Zurich, 1948),⁸⁸ notes that Zwingli increasingly acknowledged the competence of the state in church discipline, which he considered to involve secular and spiritual penalties. The latter covered exclusion from the sacrament, the more so after his controversy with Luther when Zwingli began to refer to the Eucharist as an "action of grace." Ley believes that Zwingli gave decreasing attention to the more positive and scriptural aspects of the cure of souls: pedagogical and prophylactic methods were stressed.

Scholarship is very much divided on the question of Zwingli's teaching on the Eucharist. The older, "memorial" view, as stated by Reinhold Seeberg in *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, IV (Leipzig, 1920),⁸⁹ has been rejected by Alexander Barclay in *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Glasgow, 1927),⁹⁰ chapters IV-VII. It is said that before his conflict with Luther, Zwingli "hinted" that in the Supper "Christ is really present for the believer, and is eaten anew by him as spiritual food;" during the conflict, the "negative element" of his

thought was predominant; and after the conflict and through Bucer's influence, Zwingli returned to "the more positive views he held at the outset." Undoubtedly, Barclay felt the weight of Walther Köhler's *Luther und Zwingli: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen*, I (Leipzig, 1924),⁹¹ which challenged, as lacking an understanding of political and religious tensions, the thesis of August Baur and Ernst Stähelin that Zwingli held the symbolical view, in conscious opposition to Luther, from the time of his conversion. Karl Bauer attacked Köhler in two articles: "Die Abendmahlslehre Zwinglis bis zum Beginn der Auseinandersetzung mit Luther," *Theologische Blätter*, V (1926), 217-66,⁹² and "Symbolik und Realpräsenz in der Abendmahlsanschauung Zwinglis bis 1525," *ZFK*, XLVI (1928), 97-105.⁹³ In his reply, "Zur Abendmahls Kontroverse in der Reformationszeit insbesondere zur Entwicklung der Abendmahlslehre Zwinglis," *ZFK*, XLVII (1928), 47-56,⁹⁴ Köhler insisted that Zwingli's early public witness to the real presence was sincere; and that later, "after very difficult negotiations," Zwingli was won over to Strassburg's "fiducial presence"; so that the line of influence was not Zwingli-Bucer-Calvin, but Erasmus-Bucer-Zwingli-Calvin. More recently, Cyril C. Richardson, in *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* (Evanston, 1949),⁹⁵ has concluded that Barclay confused the issue "by trying to show that Zwingli was not a Zwinglian." Ultimately, according to Richardson, "the elements are reminders of a past redemption, not vehicles of a present grace." C. J. Cadoux, in arguing against "mere commemoration," has suggested that Calvin "recognized that Zwingli's view owed its defect to the exigencies of controversy, and differed from his own in emphasis only": "Zwingli," an article in *Christian Worship: Studies in Its History and Meaning by Members of Mansfield College*, edited by Nathaniel Micklem (London, 1936).⁹⁶

Albert Hyma has gone somewhat beyond Barclay in stating that Zwingli was "easily persuaded" by Hoen's letter which he read in the Summer of 1523: "Hoen's Letter on the Eucharist and Its Influence upon Carlstadt, Bucer and Zwingli," *Princeton Theological Review*, XXIV (1927), 124-31.⁹⁷ Köhler has stated categorically that Zwingli held Erasmus' doctrine of the mystical real presence until 1524 and that Hoen's letter

was more or less decisive in bringing about the change: "Zu Zwinglis ältester Abendmahlsauffassung," *ZFK*, XLV (1926-27), 399-408.⁹⁸ William D. Maxwell, in *An Outline of Christian Worship* (London, 1936), chapter IV,⁹⁹ ascribes the peculiarities of Zwingli's teaching on the Supper to his humanistic training; he was "more rationalistic . . . less mystical, and more subjective and analytical." On the other hand, Fritz Blanke, in "Zwinglis Sakramentsanschauung," *Theologische Blätter*, X (1931), 283-90,¹⁰⁰ and Gustav Schrenk, in "Zwinglis Hauptmotiv in der Abendmahlslehre und das Neue Testament," *Zwingliana*, V (1930), 176-85,¹⁰¹ tend to justify Zwingli's position on the basis of the Biblical idea.

Walther Köhler has attempted to reconstruct *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529: Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, XLVIII (Leipzig, 1929)¹⁰² and has described it as the beginning of the ecumenical ideal ("community in essence in spite of personal particularities") in a second article, *Das Religionsgespräch zu Marburg 1529: Sammlung Gemeinverständlicher Vorträge*, Nr. 140 (Tübingen, 1929).¹⁰³ August Waldburger's *Zwinglis Reise nach Marburg* (Görlitz, 1929)¹⁰⁴ describes Zwingli's journey to the Colloquy. Discussions of Zwingli's doctrinal position in relation to other leaders include H. A. van Bakel's "Zwingli oder Luther?" *ZFK*, LII (1933), 237-62;¹⁰⁵ Fritz Blanke's "Luther, Zwingli, Calvin," *Die Furche*, XXII (1936), 421-31;¹⁰⁶ Erich Seeberg's "Der Gegensatz zwischen Zwingli, Schwenckfeld und Luther," *Reinhold Seeberg Festschrift*, I (Leipzig, 1929), 43-80;¹⁰⁷ and Belá Soós' "Zwingli und Calvin," *Zwingliana*, VI (1934-37), 306-27.¹⁰⁸

V. Social and Political Ethics

Zwingli is presented as Switzerland's "boldest . . . possibly greatest" statesman by Wilhelm Oechsli in "Zwingli als Staatsmann," *Ulrich Zwingli 1519-1919* (item 12), 75-190.¹⁰⁹ Praise is given in these pages to the Reformer's views on State and Society, his strength in battle, his attack against the mercenary and pension systems, and his "regeneration" of the Church. This unhesitating appraisal is shared by Hermann Escher in "Zwingli als Staatsmann," *Zwingliana*, V (1931), 297-317.¹¹⁰ Zwingli's social ethics have been discussed in André Bouvier's

"Zwingli, apôtre du christianisme social," *Christianisme social*, XLIV (1931), 291-304;¹¹¹ in Leonhard von Muralt's "Zwingli als Sozialpolitiker," *Zwingliana*, V (1931), 276-96;¹¹² and in Paul Meyer's *Zwingli's Soziallehren* (Linz, 1921).¹¹³ That Zwingli envisaged a Utopia has been rejected by von Muralt. His views were not grandiose but lofty: "Authentic justice is in Zwingli's eyes only the divine justice, only the law which prevails in the Kingdom of God." Meyer outlines Zwingli's ethical teaching on marriage and family, *Wirtschaft* and political life, and finds him medieval and conservative. On the other hand, Alfred Farner's *Die Lehre von Kirche und Staat bei Zwingli* (Tübingen, 1930)¹¹⁴ includes evidence that Zwingli discarded some of his earlier political opinions more easily than did Luther; as early as 1523, he appealed to the precedence of Germanic Law to justify the deposition of a tyrant. Farner has also given careful attention to the exercise of tolerance by the Swiss Reformers. A useful discussion of Zurich marriage laws and moral discipline and their influence on German Switzerland is had in Walther Köhler's *Zürcher Ehegericht und Genfer Konsistorium*, I: *Quellen und Abhandlungen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte*, VII (Leipzig, 1932).¹¹⁵

Zwingli's attitude toward Swiss Confederacy has been examined in Elsa Beurle's *Der politische Kampf um die religiöse Einheit der Eidgenossenschaft 1520-1527: Ein Beitrag zu Zwingli's Staatspolitik* (Linz, 1920)¹¹⁶ and in Heinrich Dreyfuss' *Der Politiker Ulrich Zwingli und die Entwicklung eines politischen Gemeinsinns in der Eidgenossenschaft* (Breslau, 1925), reprinted in *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Geschichte*, VI (1926), 61-126; 145-93.¹¹⁷

This article, despite its limitations, at least bears witness to the increasing and promising scholarly interest in Zwingli.

MINUTES OF THE SIXTY-EIGHTH CONSECUTIVE
PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
CHURCH HISTORY, APRIL 21-22, 1950,
AT OBERLIN, OHIO

Following the dinner at the Oberlin Inn, at which members of the Society were the guests of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, President James Hastings Nichols called the members into business session.

The minutes of the Spring Meeting in Chicago, Ill., April 7, 8, and 9, 1949, printed in *Church History*, June, 1949, were approved. The Secretary read the report of the meetings of the Council including the changes in membership and the election of 27 new members. (See Minutes of the Council.)

The major portion of the evening meeting was devoted to a consideration of the tentative report of the special committee on organization appointed at the annual meeting in Boston. The Society voted to commend the committee for its excellent study and report, expressed largely favorable reaction to the report, and requested that after further consideration the revised report be presented at the next annual meeting.

In anticipation of the enlargement of the Book-Review Section and its division into departments, the Society elected Wilhelm Pauck, upon nomination by the Council, to membership on the editorial board with the responsibility for the Book-Review Section of *Church History*.

At the business meeting on the morning of April 22, Wilhelm Pauck and the Secretary were empowered to arrange for the Spring meeting in 1951. The Secretary was also authorized to make necessary hotel and banquet arrangements for the annual meetings in December, 1950 and 1951 and collaborate with the American Historical Association in planning a joint session at each of these meetings.

The members of the Society voted unanimously and enthusiastically to express appreciation and gratitude to the President, Dean, and Professor F. W. Buckler of the Oberlin School of Theology for their hospitality.

At this meeting the following papers were read:

The Failure of Unification Efforts during the German Reformation by Hastings Eells.

The Significance of John Wise by J. Louis Wolf.

Henry Melchior Muhlenberg: A Study in Americanization by Richard C. Wolf.

German Churches Today by Wilhelm Pauck.

Attest: Raymond W. Albright,
Secretary.

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN
SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY, APRIL 21, 1950,
AT THE OBERLIN SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY,
OBERLIN, OHIO

President James Hastings Nichols presided at this meeting attended by Winthrop Hudson, Sidney E. Mead, L. J. Trinterud, Raymond W. Albright, and F. W. Buckler, chairman of the committee on program and local arrangements.

The minutes of the meeting held April 8, 1949, printed in *Church History*, June 1949, were approved.

The Secretary reported the deaths of S. G. Bland and Edwin C. Howe.

The Council voted to accept with regret the resignations of Nathan Adams, Harold T. Bienz, Charles N. Brickley, C. Lamar Derk, Earnest E. Eells, John Tracy Ellis, Douglas Horton, John M. Kelso, John G. Kuethe, Frederick A. Schilling, Henry B. Washburn, and Charles F. Whiston.

Upon nomination by the Secretary the Council voted unanimously to elect the following persons to membership in the Society, subject to the usual constitutional provisions:

Charles W. Ackers
Olan W. Aughbaugh
Allen L. Bowe
Alan Carlsten
Moses C. Crouse
Boyd Daniels
D. D. Dillon
Karl Frederic Earhart, Jr.
Charles H. Forsyth
Thomas D. Heming
Robert Henderson
Harold E. Hogue
Emil K. Holzhauser

Wallace N. Jamison
William F. Kerr
Norman Langford
Paul S. Mellish
William A. Mudhenk
Vasil Thomas Istravridis
Lindsey P. Pherigo
M. Leonard Schoonman
Richard L. Smith
Warren Thomas Smith
Robert Stevenson
A. V. Wallenkampf
E. B. Walsh

Thomas H. Hunter

Upon nomination of the Editorial Board the Council voted to nominate and present to the Society the name of Wilhelm Pauck as Book-Review Editor of *Church History*.

The report of the committee on reorganization appointed in December, 1949, was read by its chairman, James Hastings Nichols. After discussion it was voted to present the report to the Society for consideration and suggestions at the evening business session.

The Secretary read the report of the program of the Pacific Coast meeting and the Council voted to add the names of Arnold Crompton, Frank J. Klingberg, Henry M. Shirer, and Charles Whiston to our standing committee on Program and Arrangements for the Pacific Coast Meeting.

Attest:

Raymond W. Albright,
Secretary.

BOOK REVIEWS

CONSTANTINE AND THE CONVERSION OF EUROPE

By A. H. M. JONES. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949. Pp. xiv, 271. \$2.00.

This volume is one of the first to appear in a new series called "Teach Yourself History Library," edited by A. L. Rowse. It is designed for the general reader, and in format as well as in the general character of its content it reminds one of the "Home University Library" series. This new series, however, is entirely historical, or rather one should say, it is biographical; for each volume of the series is planned in such a way as to survey the history of a period by way of a biography of a great man. Such an approach to history is certainly not new, and it has obvious limitations; but it is one of the most popular ways of interesting the general public in historical study. Inasmuch as the volumes of this series are written by very competent historians, the end results of the biographical method are entirely satisfactory—certainly, if this volume on Constantine is any measure of the series as a whole, the new venture should be welcomed with enthusiasm.

It is particularly fortunate that a historian of Professor Jones' reputation should present us with a work on Constantine and his era. There has been so much debate in recent years over the authenticity of our sources for this very critical period, that one welcomes a sane and judicious handling of them for readers who have neither the time nor the competence to weigh the detailed problems for themselves. In the main, Professor Jones allies himself with the school of Professor Baynes as against the extremer positions taken of late by M. Grégoire. Although there is no documentation in the form of learned footnotes (only a brief bibliographical note at the end of the volume), the sources are quoted extensively in the narrative, and a just estimate always given or implied as to their reliability or tendentiousness. All in all this is as fine an introduction to the period as any teacher may hope to find to place in the hands of students. Inasmuch as over half the volume deals specifically with 'church history' it is likely that the book will at once find its way on the reading lists of seminarians. Since Professor Jones does not write as an ecclesiastical historian, by profession, his treatment of the controversies, Donatist and Arian, is fair and objective. He confines himself to stating facts, and is not tempted to discuss the relative merits of the doctrinal positions taken by the contending parties.

With regard to Constantine's conversion, the author steers a middle course. He believes that Constantine did experience a conversion to the Christian God shortly before his final conflict with Maxentius, but that in his untutored mind he identified "in some sort" his new object of devotion with the Unconquered Sun. Only gradually did his religious con-

victions clarify as he became more intimate with Church leaders and Church problems. The evidence of his coinage is not conclusive, according to Professor Jones, in making him out either as a calculating rationalist without real religious convictions or as a hypocrite regarding his Christian professions and sympathies. The famous vision is taken to have a real historical basis. The author gives it a meteorological explanation, which he says he owes to Professor Andrade. "What Constantine probably saw was a rare, but well-attested, form of the 'halo phenomenon'." This is a phenomenon analogous to the rainbow, and like it local and transient, caused by the fall, not of rain, but of ice crystals across the rays of the sun." (p. 96.)

The figure of Athanasius does not shine with the luster customarily bestowed upon it by orthodox Church historians. His extreme partisanship is something which does not appeal to the careful, objective view of evidence entertained by modern historians. Yet it seems to me an exaggeration on the author's part to say to him: "He was incapable of understanding any position but his own, and all who disagreed with him were in his eyes villains . . . he readily convinced himself that no one would oppose the lawful authority of his office unless they were intellectually and morally depraved." (p. 183.) Previously, the author had noted that none of Arius' opponents ever impugned his (i. e., Arius') moral character.

The account of the Council of Nicaea and its aftermath is exceptionally well done, and makes full use of all the documents brought forward in recent research. Professor Jones makes particular use of the second session of the Council in 327, when Arius was readmitted to communion—a fact which Athanasius never mentions. In regard to the *homoousion* the author believes that it was Hosius who prompted Constantine to recommend it to the Council. Constantine did not realize "how paralyzing an effect his imperial presence had on free discussion" (pp. 164-65); had he done so, the whole aftermath of the Council might have been different. But then the Christian Faith might have been different also.

Episcopal Theological School.

Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE

By GEORGE SARTON. Volume III (in 2 parts). Baltimore, 1947. Pp. xxxv, xi, 2155. \$20.00.

The latest installment of Professor Sarton's monumental *Introduction*, which was awarded the Haskins Medal in Mediaeval History for 1948, is the best and most detailed treatise on the science and learning of the fourteenth century in any language. The author interprets his subject broadly and makes room for history, philosophy, education, philology, sociology, law, and even, to some extent, for religion and theology. He overlooks no relevant fact, and his range extends not only throughout the whole of western and eastern Europe but even to Asia—to Persia, Syria, Arabia, India, China and Japan. It is impossible in a few words to do justice to the vastness of Professor Sarton's scheme or to the patience,

detail, and erudition with which he has worked it out. The tables of contents alone cover 20 closely-printed pages, and the indices are 250 pages long, most of them with double columns. All that one can say is that it is difficult to think of any topic in the history of the fourteenth century which he has failed to take into account. His book is a treasure for mediaevalists in every type; no scholar who deals with the fourteenth century dares proceed with his work without consulting Sarton. And that legendary creature, the general reader, will find here much to fascinate him.

Few will read the whole through, but it is an indispensable work of reference with magnificent bibliographies; and the principal results of the two volumes are summarized in two long introductory chapters totalling over 600 pages. One notable feature, apart from its mammoth learning and encyclopedic dimensions, is the warm, informal style of the author, which, despite the technical nature of the materials, is never dull. He avoids the heavy, labored pedanticism of the conventional encyclopaedist and writes with verve and spirit. Professor Sarton has produced a book of which he should be proud. It is well worth twenty dollars.
Harvard University, Dumbarton Oaks. Milton V. Anastos.

THE IDEA OF USURY: FROM TRIBAL BROTHERHOOD TO UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD

By BENJAMIN N. NELSON. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.
(Number 3 in The History of Ideas Series). Pp. xxi, 258. \$3.00.

In *The Idea of Usury* Professor Nelson has given us a chronicle of the changing interpretations of Deuteronomy 23:19, 20 (an ambiguous text which prohibits loans on usury to "brothers" but allows them to "strangers"). The wandering of this Mosaic double standard is briefly and brilliantly summarized, beginning with its significance in the blood brotherhood morality of the ancient Hebrew tribes, then in the attempt to transcend it by the medieval aspiration toward universal brotherhood, in its abandonment in the Reformation repudiation of "papistical" and "Mosaic" distinctions, to its inglorious burial by the utilitarianism of modern capitalistic liberalism. (There was a short-lived and belated resuscitation of the text in the early years of the nineteenth century.) Yet the author denies that his monograph is a *history* (see his Postscript).

Except for the last paragraph of the Epilogue, the essay is a demonstration of the dismal perversion not only of "the idea of usury" and the exegesis of a Scriptural passage, but also of the Christian virtues of brotherhood, friendship, and *caritas* (it is curious to observe how all those thoughts are so intimately related). The author's own appraisal, in his Postscript, cannot be improved on: "The course of the debate over usury surely had a most significant bearing on the character of the ideal of brotherhood."

On the basis of his own statement of the evidence, it seems that Professor Nelson has unduly exaggerated the importance of Calvin in the sixteenth-century rejection of the Deuteronomic limitation on usury. In earlier pages, the author has shown that even the medieval writers were

evading the restriction—the *idea* was therefore already modified long before the verbal expression was allowed to fall into disrepute (Nelson himself intimates this in a general way on page 109). The indebtedness to Weber, Tawney, Sir Henry Maine, and others is acknowledged.

It seems also that the balancing of brotherhood with "otherhood" is at least *précieux*. It might have been acceptable once or twice in the course of the essay, but the constant repetition of the literary barbarism page after page becomes as irritating and wearisome as—according to Nelson—the old arguments over usury were by the seventeenth century.

But these are minor infelicities in so excellent a work. The extensive notes and bibliography are evidence of immense erudition. The style is easy, pleasing, and convincing. The book has a wealth of seminal suggestiveness. At a number of places, Nelson indicates additional related ideas which he is planning to elaborate, as well as others of which he hopes someone else will produce studies. The monograph is a fascinating example of how rich the study of the ramifications of one idea may be.

University of Mississippi.

J. Allen Cabaniss.

THE FORMING OF AN AMERICAN TRADITION

By LEONARD J. TRINTERUD. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949. Pp. 352. \$6.50.

In the sub-title, "A Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism," the prefix might fitly have been omitted. For never has there been an examination approaching this. Professor Trinterud has given us for the first time a thorough and surely grounded account of eighteenth-century Presbyterianism, set in an illuminating context of general American history. He has mastered sources in very wide range, including much of non-Presbyterian character. Specially noteworthy are the many fugitive pamphlets and the large amount of manuscript material which he has unearthed. He has read critically the histories on his subject and many other historical works. His notes, abounding in references, convincingly support his narrative. This is written with balance, discernment and enthusiasm.

A picture of colonial Presbyterianism new in important respects emerges from the author's research. Chief among the many errors which he corrects is the idea, found in numerous books and industriously cultivated for controversial purposes, that the Presbyterian Church in its early life was predominantly Scotch-Irish. New Englanders in large numbers were settled in New York and northern New Jersey before 1700 and more followed. In these parts, it is shown, there had arisen by the 1720's a considerable Presbyterianism, its church-members principally of New England origin or antecedents, also English, Scots, Ulstermen, Welsh, Dutch, Huguenots, and among its ministers graduates of Yale and Harvard. In this connection there is an instructive comparison of Congregational and Presbyterian conceptions of the church. This part of the Presbyterian Church supplied a good portion of its leadership

and most of its liberalism. Here the preaching of the Great Awakening found its strongest response in Presbyterianism.

The detailed study of this movement, close to the sources, is unequalled. Taking its original impulse from William Tennent, Sr., and carried on by his sons and his students of the Log College, this Presbyterian Awakening grew in northern New Jersey and New York, in its rise antedating Edwards' work in Northampton; but it might not have become what it did but for the help of Whitefield, under whose fire the revival spread widely and powerfully. Contrary to repeated attributions of its teaching to pietism or even to Methodism, it is pointed out, the writings of the Tennents show that for their message of vital religious experience they drew on English and New English Puritans and also on "Scottish and Scotch-Irish revivalists and reformers." And of course when the Presbyterians of New England origin became active in the revival the Puritan inheritance was strengthened.

The opposition to the Tennents and the New Englanders which caused the great controversy in colonial Presbyterianism came from the Scotch-Irish wing of the Synod, in its southern part, centering in Philadelphia. The author's recital of many facts shows him forced to the conclusion, unwelcome to him as to others, that this opposition was fundamentally antipathy to the earnest religion propagated by the Awakening. The conservative efforts to build up an all-powerful central organization in the church, to bind on it a rigid doctrinal subscription, to impose educational restrictions on its ministry, all had this origin. Governed by old-world patterns, the men of this party, the Old Side, could not tolerate the free native church life growing up in the other wing and its fervent piety, alien to their traditions. They held to formal orthodoxy and authoritarian ecclesiasticism.

The opposition led to the schism of 1741 in the Synod and thence to the formation of 1745 of the Synod of New York, by a combination of the Tennents and their associates, driven out in 1741, and the Presbytery of New York. No one before Professor Trinterud has adequately presented the significance of this part of the church, the New Side. Spreading ultimately from New York to Virginia, this Synod was marked by evangelistic and church-building zeal, missionary vision—David Brainerd belonged to it—and enthusiasm for education, evinced especially in the founding of what is now Princeton University. It acted as an American church, meeting the needs of its society. Hence when the Synod of New York and of Philadelphia came together in 1758, to make the Presbyterian Church of later colonial history, New York had increased from 22 ministers to 73, while Philadelphia had decreased from 27 to 23. Thus the Synod of New York gave character to colonial Presbyterianism and led in "the forming of an American tradition."

The author has been called strongly partisan against the Old Side. It seems to this reviewer that his documentation, resting considerably on new sources, unanswerably bears out such unfavorable statements as he makes, and that he handles evidence fairly here as elsewhere. He does

not hesitate to call attention to faults in character and errors in judgment in the New Side.

A chapter on doctrine enlighteningly discusses the Federal theology. This both Sides inherited, each developing one of its "incompatible elements" the Old Side its rationalism and the New Side its evangelicalism. The New Side emphasized "the Puritan pilgrimage motif and the Puritan doctrines of conviction and assurance, and thus gave prominence to "the more evangelical aspects of the Puritan understanding of the Christian life," shaping the Awakening. Late in the century a large Scotch-Irish immigration, whose important effects are described in "The Wavering of Destiny," cause a marked strengthening of rationalistic Federalism.

Space forbids mention of other corrections of vulgar errors which exemplify the author's new light on his subject. Chapters of high merit, again utilizing fresh sources, treat the opposition of Presbyterians, partly in union with Connecticut Congregationalists, to Anglican establishment, and their activity in the War of Independence. "The Church in the Confederation" is informing on church life over the whole extent of Presbyterianism in a neglected period. Here appears the Presbyterian attitude toward slavery and other social questions, interest in which had come from the New Side. In this time the Presbyterian Church was "the largest, the best organized and the most virile of the Churches in its areas." A wholly unprecedented detailed study of the formation of the constitution by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. dispels the mystery in which the subject has been wrapt. The church is seen to have been organized, not on the Scottish model, from the top, the General Assembly, down, but in an American spirit, from the bottom, the presbytery, up. The cherished legend of the patterning of the constitution of the United States after Presbyterian polity is finally dismissed.

A continuation of this indispensable and delightful history is a necessity.

New York City.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

THE ADMONITION CONTROVERSY

By DONALD JOSEPH MCGINN. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1949. Pp. x, 589. \$6.50.

In 1572 an anonymous pamphlet entitled *Admonition to Parliament*, probably written by John Field and Thomas Wilcox, was published in an effort to win the English people to the support of the Presbyterian system of church government. With the appearance of this pamphlet the Vestiarian Controversy gave place to the Admonition Controversy in which the more fundamental differences between the Episcopalians were brought into public discussion. Differences of opinion over these issues were to be the determining factors in English church history for more than a century. The appearance of the *Admonition to Parliament* precipitated a pamphlet warfare in which Cartwright and Whitgift were the principal disputants.

Part I of the present volume gives the historical background of this

controversy. Part II cites the arguments of Cartwright and Whitgift in direct quotations from their writings. Three hundred and ninety pages of these quotations enable the reader to follow the arguments from both sides on every major topic discussed. The materials quoted are arranged with rare ingenuity and with ample documentation. They furnish an indispensable collection of source material on an important phase of English church history.

Part I gives an illuminating picture of the rise of the Admonition Controversy. However, this section is subject to criticism in that it gives a somewhat biased presentation of the clashing viewpoints. Since McGinn is about to let Cartwright and Whitgift speak for themselves, it seems unnecessary to attempt to prejudice the reader against Cartwright and his views by labelling the Puritan champion as guilty of "careless scholarship," "loose logic," "neither logical nor honest," being a "Puritan fanatic," presenting "a woefully distorted interpretation of his opponent's argument," using "a cloud of ambiguous clauses," and recommending "immediate death for all who would not conform to the Presbyterian 'discipline.'"

This seems hardly fair to the reader who turns to Part II and finds that Whitgift's approach is likewise often devoid of both sweetness and light. In fact, he is guilty of many of the offenses charged against Cartwright. Would it not be preferable to have the reader form his own conclusions as to the relative merits of the two disputants and their arguments? Furthermore, Cartwright is belabored for the faulty proof-reading work on his pamphlets, but McGinn is guilty of the same offense on Page viii of his Preface when he refers to M. M. Knappen as "T. W. Knappen." These are incidental matters. This book will prove a valuable aid to any student who wishes to understand the conflict within the Anglican Church between the Puritans and the Episcopalians.

Vanderbilt School of Religion.

J. Minton Batten.

MARGARET FELL, MOTHER OF QUAKERISM

By ISABEL ROSS. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949. Pp. 421. \$6.00.

Anyone who looks through the pages of the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* will begin to realize with what loving care Quakers have tracked down the full details of the movement's past. The same spirit is evident in this work. Here will be found a complete history of Margaret Fell, her family, the Swarthmore community, and indeed much of English Quakerism as a whole. And certainly the subtitle, "Mother of Quakerism," is entirely appropriate, for few women have borne so completely a maternal relationship to a religious movement. Supervising the copying of Fox's letters to the meetings, assembling historical records, systematizing the activities of the first "publishers of truth," writing to "Oliver" or "Charles" about imprisoned Friends, and assuming the leadership of a host of other activities, Margaret Fell turned Swarthmore into a sort of nerve-center for the entire movement. But above all else was the spiritual help which flowed from her dominant personality. Scores of Quakers confided in

her, and William Caton even had visions of her—"spinning flax most joyfully . . . arrayed like a lily of the field."

A great deal of work went into this study. It possesses all of the traditional apparatus of full documentation, letters, and appendices, and its loyalty to historical accuracy is such that probably the only point of dispute might be the overly protective attitude toward Fox in his quarrel with Nayler. But there are a few disappointments as well. One feels that the author's grasp of the historical background is occasionally rather tenuous, as in the comparison of Quakers and Fifth Monarchy Men (p. 85) or the treatment of the Declaration of Indulgence (p. 328); and there is little evidence of any real understanding of the place of Quakerism in the mid-century breakdown of traditional, social, political, and religious patterns. Some problems, moreover, could certainly have been more deeply probed. One wonders, for instance, about the nature and extent of a "seeker" spirit in Furness which prepared the way of Fox's message, and the equally interesting fact that not all who were "tender" entered the Quaker community. And especially, what of that strange, silent figure, Judge Fell himself, declining to attend the meetings at Swarthmore but leaving the doors ajar so that he might witness the worship?

Perhaps the most serious criticism of this work is its inordinate length. This may be ungrateful in a reviewer, and possibly some excuse should be made for the fact that the author is a descendant of her subject. But much of this material is only slightly connected with Margaret Fell, and some of it can be included only by stretching the definition of relevance to impossible limits. A good book is often made a better book by knowing what to leave out, and a vigorous use of the scissors would have helped here.

University of Minnesota (Duluth).

James F. Maclear.

YOUNG MR. NEWMAN

By MAISIE WARD. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1948. Pp. 477. \$4.50.

Miss Ward is the daughter of W. G. Ward, whose *Life of Cardinal Newman* in two volumes has been accorded almost official status by Catholics, though recognized as scanty in data for the period before 1844. The Anglican period of Newman has hitherto been best covered by E. A. Abbott's *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*; Y. Brilioth's *The Anglican Revival*, Francis Newman's *Contributions to the Early Life of Cardinal Newman* and sundry other excellent studies, all of which are now to be regarded as secondary. For Miss Ward has made use of all of them and their primary sources, as well as of a vast amount of "Autographic Remains": unpublished, unabridged letters, *juvenilia* such as play scripts, cartoons, etc., which had been stored away and virtually forgotten in the Birmingham Oratory. For plenitude of sources and thoroughness of treatment, the book may well be regarded henceforth as Volume I, with W. G. Ward's work becoming Volumes II and III. Newman's Evangelical years are appraised with insight and sympathy (*vide* chapter VII). Other background or prelude subjects are done equally well, such as "The Church and the People" (chapter XIX); "At Trinity"

(chapter IV). Consistently—but significantly—there is virtually no reference to the vicious economic and social conditions of the “Black Forties” or to the Ecclesiastical Commission’s work of church reform (1836 on).

Miss Ward is evidently at pains to correct the contention of some that the young Newman was an unsocial, over-cerebralized introvert. He was, indeed, under his father’s pressure, very precocious—Homer at ten! And he was forever writing something—doggerel, plays, letters—and saving every pen scratch! His imaginative talent and fervor show in his passion for writing and acting dramas; in his dreamy yet almost virtuoso violin playing—and much poetizing. He had weak eyes, poor teeth, frequent spells of indigestion, generally a neurasthenic diathesis. In hitherto suppressed entries in his Diary he recorded his spiritual agonies over “impurity” and already at fifteen he described himself as “living a life of sin with a very profane spirit”—without being more explicit! Shortly thereafter, in despair of rational self-control he vowed to live a life of sexlessness. On the other hand, he did go swimming, boating, riding, went to parties and was fond of good food and beer—when he could afford them. Though harshly threatened by would-be hazers, he steadfastly refused to get drunk at a college “Gaudy” (i. e., “Gaudemus igitur . . .”). He was devoted, though somewhat imperiously, to his fatherless mother, sisters and brother, even to the point of hurtful privation and overwork. He was a capital tutor, though exacting and inclined to moralize and indoctrinate. In everything he was intense; in nothing, easy-going.

How Newman could have recalled so meticulously for the *Apologia* all the nuances and detours of his theological transit from Canterbury to Rome is answered by Miss Ward with the statement that his “profound interest in his own past is seen in the care given to arranging and re-arranging letters, copying and re-copying memoranda, etc.” What a picture! The would-be Athanasius, exiled by the Anglicans, neglected by Rome, toiling over the fading souvenirs of his Oxford heyday in the dingy rooms of the Birmingham Oratory! It confirms the reviewer’s suspicion that the conversion of 1845 was an escapist act of a sadly wounded ego, whose congenial self-assertiveness could retrieve its morale, after the rebuff of Tract XC, only by assimilation with the supreme authoritarian egoism of Rome. The pull of the latter plainly discernible in the now copiously published impressions of the first visit to Rome (1832) and it may be significant that Miss Ward omits all reference to the two hymns published in the *Lyra Apostolica* that brother Francis Newman adduces as proof of his brother’s duplicity in the stratagem of the *via media*. But modern psychiatry knows well that a powerful egoism can synchro-mesh with religious authoritarianism so naturally and unconsciously that any question of insincerity is irrelevant. There is ample material in this book for any psychologist who is interested to learn by what process and for what reason Cardinal Newman added Rome to “the two only absolute and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator” of his boyhood conversion experience (page 26). God, apparently, was not absolute and luminous enough!

The Meadville Theological School.

Charles H. Lyttle.

GRUNDRISS ZUM STUDIUM DER KIRCHENGESCHICHTE

By HEINRICH BORNKAMM. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1949, Pp. 129.

This booklet is a guide to the study of church history in the form largely of a bibliographical survey. Naturally it is intended for German students and deals primarily with German literature. For obvious reasons in the modern period the church history of Germany is more prominently treated than that of other countries. One observes with interest that in the period of the early church Bornkamm considers that the basic church history is the work of Lietzmann. For the Middle Ages his advice is read Hauck. But for the modern period he discovers no work so fundamental in character. At the back of the book will be found as a separate insert a leaflet consisting of parallel chronological tables; much briefer than those of Weingarten, and because of their compactness, highly serviceable. A merit of this work is that it takes into account the archeological and iconographic aids for the teaching of church history. Among the latter the following book is mentioned: Erwin Preuschen, *Illustrierte Kirchengeschichte für das christliche Haus*. 2d ed. 1908. This book though serviceable is really not excellent, and Bornkamm rightly says that we need a good illustrated church history.

Yale University.

Roland H. Bainton.

THE POWERS OF THE CROWN IN SCOTLAND

Being a Translation, with notes and an Introductory Essay, of GEORGE BUCHANAN'S "De Jure Regni Apud Scottos." By CHARLES FLINN ARROWOOD. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1949. Pp. xi, 150.

The appearance in a new English translation of Buchanan's *De jure* will be eagerly welcomed. The only other translation known to me is that of Robert Macfarlane made in 1799 and reprinted in the *Presbyterian's Armoury*, Volume III (Edinburgh, 1846). Dr. Arrowood is not indebted to this translation, and does not mention it. His Introduction gives essentials of Buchanan's life, but mentions none of the biographies (such as those of Brown and Macmillan) later than 1806. Nor does he refer to *George Buchanan, Glasgow Quartercentenary Studies* (1907), a series of essays which includes Professor McKechnie's scholarly study of the *De jure*. One misses too—since Arrowood makes comparisons of Buchanan's thought with that of Ponet in the *Short Treatise of Politike Power*—any reference to Hudson's *John Ponet, Advocate of Limited Monarchy* (Chicago, 1942). Dr. Arrowood is in substantial agreement with MacKechnie in the stress he lays upon John Major's influence on Buchanan. But he has not fully observed the element of reason and natural law in Ponet's treatise, to which Hudson has justly called attention, and has thus, it seems to me, overstated Buchanan's divergence from Ponet, while acknowledging a wide range of agreement.

Although the Introduction is rather disappointing in its failure to relate the writer's opinions with those of others who have treated its

materials more amply, it shows a clear discernment of the essentials of Buchanan's thought in this great dialogue.

Arrowood finds the peculiar importance of the work in its synthesis of "ideas from classical antiquity, the later Middle Ages, Scottish history, the Italian Renaissance, and the second, or Calvinist phase of the Reformation." It is possible, I think, to argue that Buchanan's synthesis is not complete. The rhetorical laudation of the office of a good king is hardly consistent with the insistence on the King's subjection to the laws and his subordination to the people. St. Paul's teaching in Romans 13 seems to give Buchanan some embarrassment. And the relation of the doctrine of the law of nature divinely given which can be understood as the love of God and neighbor (chapter iv) with the affirmation "populus lege potentior" (chapter xliii) is not adequately clarified. Arrowood's rendering of this phrase, "the nation superior to the law," may suggest, to moderns familiar with lawless nationalism, more than Buchanan intended. His point really is that the people, not the king, make the (positive) laws by which both they and the king are governed. This is not inconsistent with the doctrine that God implants the natural law of association, love and equity; but the connection is assumed rather than explained.

Dr. Arrowood's contribution is primarily that of a translator, and he has shown a sound conception of the translator's task. The dialogue retains the sprightliness of the original; in this respect it differs from MacFarlane's tedious text. The rendering is marked by free divergence from the literal, but this is thoughtfully done and often conveys the author's real meaning much better than would a verbally exact reproduction. A translation is always open to debate, however, and I would question one of the passages in which such liberty has been used. On page 100 the word "Scottish" appears in the translation and on page 109, "among the Scots," where Buchanan does not use that language. It seems to me justifiable in the former instance, but not in the latter. On page 100 both the preceding sentence where the original is "Ita tradunt serum nostrarum scriptores," and the passage following, justify "Scottish," and the word helps toward clarification. In the other case Buchanan says:

Primum omnium visum est nobis Regem populi causa creari, neque homo Rege quidquam praestantius divinitus nobis dari, neque malo pestilentius.

I believe this striking generalization is not to be narrowed down to the Scottish field. The *visum est nobis* goes back to "what has been agreed between us" (*inter nos*) in the last sentence preceding, and surely means "it has seemed to us (who participate in his dialogue)." Further, even if *visum est nobis* had a reference to the Scots in general, the rendering: "it is understood that among the Scots the king is made for the sake of the people," should rather be: "it is understood among the Scots that," etc.

I am perplexed by the opening sentence of chapter 1, where "a diligent student of contemporary life and opinion in France" is made to do duty for the different expression, "eumque diligenter de statu rerum Gallicarum percontatus essem" (and I had interrogated him closely on the state of

French affairs). On page 106 Buchanan's "cclx" is rendered "two hundred and fifty." I have noted misprints of slight importance on pages 24, 31, 50, 107, 110.

But it would be unfair to press such points in what will prove a very useful and is on the whole a reliable translation of a book that, as the translator remarks, is "one of the most important political treatises ever written."

Union Theological Seminary.

John T. McNeill.

A TEPEE IN HIS FRONT YARD

By CLIFFORD M. DRURY. Portland, Oregon: Binfords & Mort, 1949. Pp. 206. \$3.00.

The story of the church in the settlement of the Pacific Northwest is one of adventure, heroism, conviction, zealous endeavor, petty religious quarrels, and political intrigue. Clifford M. Drury, in a series of biographical studies, has faithfully and effectively portrayed the religious leaders of the period in these various circumstances and roles. Although the materials for some parts of this study were meager, and the subject not so significant as Marcus Whitman or Henry Harvey Spalding, the author has succeeded, in this, the fourth biography in the series, in telling an exciting tale and adding to understanding of the role of the church in the frontier community.

The biography begins, in the year 1871, with the graduation of Cowley from Auburn Theological Seminary, his interview with Spalding, who was then traveling in the East, his appointment to the Lapwai mission in southwest Idaho (not far from the site of the Whitman massacre), and his subsequent journey, with his wife and three children, by trans-continental train and boat to the frontier Indian Agency and mission. In the early chapters, because of the meagerness of materials, the author uses constructed dialogue. In so doing he is faithful to his data but, stylistically, he is less effective than in the simple exposition and narrative of the later chapters. The author tells of the effectiveness of Cowley as a teacher of Indian children, his success as a preacher to the Indians, the bitter quarrel which he and Spalding had with the government Agent (both Cowley and Spalding, while serving as non-salaried appointees of the Presbyterian board, were on government salaries and therefore were subordinate to the Agent), Cowley's dismissal and his struggle for an existence in a frontier community, and his continued devotion and service to the church. The reader is kept in high suspense as he follows Cowley through his series of crises. The final chapters tell of Cowley's removal to the Spokane area (through the influence of Spalding), his work among the Indians, his part in the founding of Spokane, and his acquisition of great wealth; an unexpected acquisition, yet one easily understandable in the light of the character traits which had earlier caused him to suffer poverty and hardship.

The reader might wish that the writer had come to grips with the problem of the church and the government in the handling of the Indian

affairs. Was the church guilty of exploiting the state for the forwarding of its own ends? Were the interests of church and state coincident? Did the church actually improve (as seems assumed) the government's administration of Indian affairs?

Nonetheless the biography is interestingly and objectively written. It is attractively printed and contains, as do the earlier volumes, a helpful map on the flyleaf and inside cover. It is an important contribution both to the history of the Pacific Northwest and to the history of the church in the area.

University of Oregon.

Robert D. Clark.

EARLY AMERICAN METHODISM

By WADE CRAWFORD BARCLAY. New York: The Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, 1949, Pp. 449. \$3.50.

This is the first in a series of six volumes under the title: *The History of Methodist Missions*. The work is divided into four parts:

- I. Early American Methodism, 1769-1844, in two volumes.
- II. Missions in the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1845-1939, in two volumes.
- III. Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1845-1939, and Missions of the Methodist Protestant Church.
- IV. World Outreach of Methodist Missions in Evangelism, Education, Literature, Cooperation, and Medical Service.

A native of Iowa, graduate of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Dr. Barclay was for fourteen years a pastor, five years editor of Church School literature, and eighteen years Executive Secretary of the Joint Committee on Religious Education in Foreign Fields.

"Foreign Missions" had hardly come to consciousness among Protestants at the founding of the Methodist Church, and the first missionaries to be sent out by any denomination in America were not on their way until about the middle of the period covered in this first volume. The discussion here, therefore, is concerned with the rise of Methodism and with the development of the sense of "Missions."

The author has brought together an almost unbelievable mass of information: excerpts from diaries, journals, Conference records and resolutions; comments upon the spread of population and the growth of industry in the United States, social, educational, and political affairs. In this amazing compilation he exhibits a fairness, a sympathy, a breadth of appreciation which is most pleasing. Many men in the future making study of specific movements in the Church will turn back to these pages and to the bibliographies which he cites.

One lays the book down with a sense of genuine gratitude; at the same time it could be wished that the author had been able to draw from his many facts a clearer picture of the real meaning of the Church and its work in this period.

Southern Methodist University.

Robert W. Goodloe.

BOOK NOTICES

C. M. AHERNE, *Valerio of Bierzo, an Ascetic of the Late Visigothic Period* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of American Press, 1949), pp. 211. An annotated edition of his *Autobiography* and an English translation of it, together with a critical introduction.

BEDE, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, Books I and II, trans. Michael MacLagan (Oxford: Blackwell, 1949 and N. Y.: Macmillan, 1950), pp. 195, \$1.25.

E. MERTON COULTER, *The Confederate States of America, 1861-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950), pp. 644. \$7.00. Contains an informative chapter on "Literary Activities, Education, and Religion."

OSCAR CULLMANN, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, Trans. Floyd V. Filson (Phila.: Westminster, 1950), pp. 253. \$5.00.

GREGORY OF TOURS, *Selections from the Minor Works*, Trans. William C. McDermott (Phila.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949), pp. 109. \$2.50.

LOUIS B. JENNINGS, *The Bibliography and Biography of Shirley Jackson Case* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), pp. 39.

EDWARD T. RAMSDALL, *The Christian Perspective* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950), pp. 218. \$2.50.

JEREMIAH J. SMITH, *The Attitude of John Peckham toward Monastic Homes under His Jurisdiction* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1949), pp. 172.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Attention is called to the forthcoming publication of the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*—a scholarly medium to be published in England; "twice a year for the present, in April and October, each number consisting of 128 pp. Royal 8vo." The editor, indicated below, will be glad to receive subscriptions and the offer of scholarly articles for publication. The price to subscribers will be twenty-five shillings (\$3.50) a year, payable by International Money Order to Faber and Faber, Ltd., 24 Russell Square, London, W. C. 1, England. All correspondence relating to the journal should be directed to the Reverend C. W. Dugmore, The University, Manchester 13, England.



